

# Exhibit 6

ElfWdroH

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK  
-----x

3 DROPLETS, INC.,

4 Plaintiff,

5 v.

12 CV 2326 (CM)

6 E\*TRADE FINANCIAL CORPORATION,  
7 et al.,

8 Defendants.

9 -----x  
10 New York, N.Y.  
11 January 15, 2014  
12 10:00 a.m.  
13  
14 Before:  
15  
16 HON. COLLEEN McMAHON,  
17 District Judge  
18  
19 APPEARANCES  
20  
21 MCKOOL SMITH P.C.  
22 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
BY: COURTLAND REICHMAN  
JOSHUA W. BUDWIN  
JAMES E. QUIGLEY  
LAUREN L. FORNAROTTO  
23  
24 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI, P.C.  
25 Attorneys for E\*Trade, Charles Schwab,  
Scottrade, and TD Ameritrade Defendants  
BY: LARRY L. SHATZER  
JESSICA L. MARGOLIS  
MICHAEL B. LEVIN  
BRIAN D. RANGE  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
2510  
2511  
2512  
2513  
2514  
2515  
2516  
2517  
2518  
2519  
2520  
2521  
2522  
2523  
2524  
2525  
2526  
2527  
2528  
2529  
2530  
2531  
2532  
2533  
2534  
2535  
2536  
2537  
2538  
2539  
2540  
2541  
2542  
2543  
2544  
2545  
2546  
2547  
2548  
2549  
2550  
2551  
2552  
2553  
2554  
2555  
2556  
2557  
2558  
2559  
2560  
2561  
2562  
2563  
2564  
2565  
2566  
2567  
2568  
2569  
2570  
2571  
2572  
2573  
2574  
2575  
2576  
2577  
2578  
2579  
2580  
2581  
2582  
2583  
2584  
2585  
2586  
2587  
2588  
2589  
2590  
2591  
2592  
2593  
2594  
2595  
2596  
2597  
2598  
2599  
25100  
25111  
25122  
25133  
25144  
25155  
25166  
25177  
25188  
25199  
25200  
25211  
25222  
25233  
25244  
25255  
25266  
25277  
25288  
25299  
25300  
25311  
25322  
25333  
25344  
25355  
25366  
25377  
25388  
25399  
25400  
25411  
25422  
25433  
25444  
25455  
25466  
25477  
25488  
25499  
25500  
25511  
25522  
25533  
25544  
25555  
25566  
25577  
25588  
25599  
25600  
25611  
25622  
25633  
25644  
25655  
25666  
25677  
25688  
25699  
25700  
25711  
25722  
25733  
25744  
25755  
25766  
25777  
25788  
25799  
25800  
25811  
25822  
25833  
25844  
25855  
25866  
25877  
25888  
25899  
25900  
25911  
25922  
25933  
25944  
25955  
25966  
25977  
25988  
25999  
251000  
251111  
251222  
251333  
251444  
251555  
251666  
251777  
251888  
251999  
252000  
252111  
252222  
252333  
252444  
252555  
252666  
252777  
252888  
252999  
253000  
253111  
253222  
253333  
253444  
253555  
253666  
253777  
253888  
253999  
254000  
254111  
254222  
254333  
254444  
254555  
254666  
254777  
254888  
254999  
255000  
255111  
255222  
255333  
255444  
255555  
255666  
255777  
255888  
255999  
256000  
256111  
256222  
256333  
256444  
256555  
256666  
256777  
256888  
256999  
257000  
257111  
257222  
257333  
257444  
257555  
257666  
257777  
257888  
257999  
258000  
258111  
258222  
258333  
258444  
258555  
258666  
258777  
258888  
258999  
259000  
259111  
259222  
259333  
259444  
259555  
259666  
259777  
259888  
259999  
2510000  
2511111  
2512222  
2513333  
2514444  
2515555  
2516666  
2517777  
2518888  
2519999  
2520000  
2521111  
2522222  
2523333  
2524444  
2525555  
2526666  
2527777  
2528888  
2529999  
2530000  
2531111  
2532222  
2533333  
2534444  
2535555  
2536666  
2537777  
2538888  
2539999  
2540000  
2541111  
2542222  
2543333  
2544444  
2545555  
2546666  
2547777  
2548888  
2549999  
2550000  
2551111  
2552222  
2553333  
2554444  
2555555  
2556666  
2557777  
2558888  
2559999  
2560000  
2561111  
2562222  
2563333  
2564444  
2565555  
2566666  
2567777  
2568888  
2569999  
2570000  
2571111  
2572222  
2573333  
2574444  
2575555  
2576666  
2577777  
2578888  
2579999  
2580000  
2581111  
2582222  
2583333  
2584444  
2585555  
2586666  
2587777  
2588888  
2589999  
2590000  
2591111  
2592222  
2593333  
2594444  
2595555  
2596666  
2597777  
2598888  
2599999  
25100000  
25111111  
25122222  
25133333  
25144444  
25155555  
25166666  
25177777  
25188888  
25199999  
25200000  
25211111  
25222222  
25233333  
25244444  
25255555  
25266666  
25277777  
25288888  
25299999  
25300000  
25311111  
25322222  
25333333  
25344444  
25355555  
25366666  
25377777  
25388888  
25399999  
25400000  
25411111  
25422222  
25433333  
25444444  
25455555  
25466666  
25477777  
25488888  
25499999  
25500000  
25511111  
25522222  
25533333  
25544444  
25555555  
25566666  
25577777  
25588888  
25599999  
25600000  
25611111  
25622222  
25633333  
25644444  
25655555  
25666666  
25677777  
25688888  
25699999  
25700000  
25711111  
25722222  
25733333  
25744444  
25755555  
25766666  
25777777  
25788888  
25799999  
25800000  
25811111  
25822222  
25833333  
25844444  
25855555  
25866666  
25877777  
25888888  
25899999  
25900000  
25911111  
25922222  
25933333  
25944444  
25955555  
25966666  
25977777  
25988888  
25999999  
251000000  
251111111  
251222222  
251333333  
251444444  
251555555  
251666666  
251777777  
251888888  
251999999  
252000000  
252111111  
252222222  
252333333  
252444444  
252555555  
252666666  
252777777  
252888888  
252999999  
253000000  
253111111  
253222222  
253333333  
253444444  
253555555  
253666666  
253777777  
253888888  
253999999  
254000000  
254111111  
254222222  
254333333  
254444444  
254555555  
254666666  
254777777  
254888888  
254999999  
255000000  
255111111  
255222222  
255333333  
255444444  
255555555  
255666666  
255777777  
255888888  
255999999  
256000000  
256111111  
256222222  
256333333  
256444444  
256555555  
256666666  
256777777  
256888888  
256999999  
257000000  
257111111  
257222222  
257333333  
257444444  
257555555  
257666666  
257777777  
257888888  
257999999  
258000000  
258111111  
258222222  
258333333  
258444444  
258555555  
258666666  
258777777  
258888888  
258999999  
259000000  
259111111  
259222222  
259333333  
259444444  
259555555  
259666666  
259777777  
259888888  
259999999  
2510000000  
2511111111  
2512222222  
2513333333  
2514444444  
2515555555  
2516666666  
2517777777  
2518888888  
2519999999  
2520000000  
2521111111  
2522222222  
2523333333  
2524444444  
2525555555  
2526666666  
2527777777  
2528888888  
2529999999  
2530000000  
2531111111  
2532222222  
2533333333  
2534444444  
2535555555  
2536666666  
2537777777  
2538888888  
2539999999  
2540000000  
2541111111  
2542222222  
2543333333  
2544444444  
2545555555  
2546666666  
2547777777  
2548888888  
2549999999  
2550000000  
2551111111  
2552222222  
2553333333  
2554444444  
2555555555  
2556666666  
2557777777  
2558888888  
2559999999  
2560000000  
2561111111  
2562222222  
2563333333  
2564444444  
2565555555  
2566666666  
2567777777  
2568888888  
2569999999  
2570000000  
2571111111  
2572222222  
2573333333  
2574444444  
2575555555  
2576666666  
2577777777  
2578888888  
2579999999  
2580000000  
2581111111  
2582222222  
2583333333  
2584444444  
2585555555  
2586666666  
2587777777  
2588888888  
2589999999  
2590000000  
2591111111  
2592222222  
2593333333  
2594444444  
2595555555  
2596666666  
2597777777  
2598888888  
2599999999  
25100000000  
25111111111  
25122222222  
25133333333  
25144444444  
25155555555  
25166666666  
25177777777  
25188888888  
25199999999  
25200000000  
25211111111  
25222222222  
25233333333  
25244444444  
25255555555  
25266666666  
25277777777  
25288888888  
25299999999  
25300000000  
25311111111  
25322222222  
25333333333  
25344444444  
25355555555  
25366666666  
25377777777  
25388888888  
25399999999  
25400000000  
25411111111  
25422222222  
25433333333  
25444444444  
25455555555  
25466666666  
25477777777  
25488888888  
25499999999  
25500000000  
25511111111  
25522222222  
25533333333  
25544444444  
25555555555  
25566666666  
25577777777  
25588888888  
25599999999  
25600000000  
25611111111  
25622222222  
25633333333  
25644444444  
25655555555  
25666666666  
25677777777  
25688888888  
25699999999  
25700000000  
25711111111  
25722222222  
25733333333  
25744444444  
25755555555  
25766666666  
25777777777  
25788888888  
25799999999  
25800000000  
25811111111  
25822222222  
25833333333  
25844444444  
25855555555  
25866666666  
25877777777  
25888888888  
25899999999  
25900000000  
25911111111  
25922222222  
25933333333  
25944444444  
25955555555  
25966666666  
25977777777  
25988888888  
25999999999  
251000000000  
251111111111  
251222222222  
251333333333  
251444444444  
251555555555  
251666666666  
251777777777  
251888888888  
251999999999  
252000000000  
252111111111  
252222222222  
252333333333  
252444444444  
252555555555  
252666666666  
252777777777  
252888888888  
252999999999  
253000000000  
253111111111  
253222222222  
253333333333  
253444444444  
253555555555  
253666666666  
253777777777  
253888888888  
253999999999  
254000000000  
254111111111  
254222222222  
254333333333  
254444444444  
254555555555  
254666666666  
254777777777  
254888888888  
254999999999  
255000000000  
255111111111  
255222222222  
255333333333  
255444444444  
255555555555  
255666666666  
255777777777  
255888888888  
255999999999  
256000000000  
256111111111  
256222222222  
256333333333  
256444444444  
256555555555  
256666666666  
256777777777  
256888888888  
256999999999  
257000000000  
257111111111  
257222222222  
257333333333  
257444444444  
257555555555  
257666666666  
257777777777  
257888888888  
257999999999  
258000000000  
258111111111  
258222222222  
258333333333  
258444444444  
258555555555  
258666666666  
258777777777  
258888888888  
258999999999  
259000000000  
259111111111  
259222222222  
259333333333  
259444444444  
259555555555  
259666666666  
259777777777  
259888888888  
259999999999  
2510000000000  
2511111111111  
2512222222222  
2513333333333  
2514444444444  
2515555555555  
2516666666666  
2517777777777  
2518888888888  
2519999999999  
2520000000000  
2521111111111  
2522222222222  
2523333333333  
2524444444444  
2525555555555  
2526666666666  
2527777777777  
2528888888888  
2529999999999  
2530000000000  
2531111111111  
2532222222222  
2533333333333  
2534444444444  
2535555555555  
2536666666666  
2537777777777  
2538888888888  
2539999999999  
2540000000000  
2541111111111  
2542222222222  
2543333333333  
2544444444444  
2545555555555  
2546666666666  
2547777777777  
2548888888888  
2549999999999  
2550000000000  
2551111111111  
2552222222222  
2553333333333  
2554444444444  
2555555555555  
2556666666666  
2557777777777  
2558888888888  
2559999999999  
2560000000000  
2561111111111  
2562222222222  
2563333333333  
2564444444444  
2565555555555  
2566666666666  
2567777777777  
2568888888888  
2569999999999  
2570000000000  
2571111111111  
2572222222222  
2573333333333  
2574444444444  
2575555555555  
2576666666666  
2577777777777  
2578888888888  
2579999999999  
2580000000000  
2581111111111  
2582222222222  
2583333333333  
2584444444444  
2585555555555  
2586666666666  
2587777777777  
2588888888888  
2589999999999  
2590000000000  
2591111111111  
2592222222222  
2593333333333  
2594444444444  
2595555555555  
2596666666666  
2597777777777  
2598888888888  
2599999999999  
25100000000000  
25111111111111  
25122222222222  
25133333333333  
25144444444444  
25155555555555  
25166666666666  
25177777777777  
2518888

ElfWdroH

1 (Case called)

2 MR. REICHMAN: Good morning, your Honor. Courtland  
3 Reichman here, on behalf of Droplets. With me is Josh Budwin,  
4 to my right, and James Quigley. And behind me is Lauren  
5 Fornarotto. We also have representatives of our clients, Ingo  
6 Theuerkauf and David Berkerian.

7 THE COURT: We aren't set up so one side is at the  
8 front table?

9 MR. BUDWIN: The way the media was set up, we're going  
10 to have to share across the table.

11 THE COURT: Everything is totally backwards. First of  
12 all, the plaintiff is always to my left. The plaintiff should  
13 be at the front table. We have the plaintiff at the right and  
14 only half of the front table. Don't blame me if I get you all  
15 screwed up because I've been doing this for 18 years the same  
16 way. Plaintiffs are on the left and in the front.

17 Defendants.

18 MS. MARGOLIS: Good morning, your Honor. On behalf of  
19 defendants E\*Trade, TD Ameritrade, Scottrade, and Charles  
20 Schwab, I'm Jessica Margolis from Wilson Sonsini Goodrich &  
21 Rosati. I'm joined by, at the front table, my colleague Brian  
22 Range and, at the back table, joined by Larry Shatzer and  
23 Michael Levin. We also have our expert Dr. Michael Shamos at  
24 the back table in the center. Finally, we've got  
25 representatives from two of our clients here today, Mr. David

ElfWdroH

1 Hale from TD Ameritrade and John Bersin from E\*Trade. And,  
2 your Honor, Mr. Shatzer, at the back table, will be primarily  
3 addressing the Court today on behalf of defendants.

4 THE COURT: . We're here because we have this one  
5 little, but critical, part of the claim construction to finish,  
6 and in that regard, you have submitted affidavits from  
7 Dr. Martin on behalf of Droplets and Dr. Shamos on behalf of  
8 the defendants.

9 We start with my disclaimer, which you've heard  
10 before. I am a Luddite. I am not a computer person. This is  
11 a glorified typewriter and post office, as far as I'm  
12 concerned. And I'm not shy about that, but I'm not really as  
13 unsophisticated as I appear. So I need things explained very  
14 clearly.

15 In that regard, I understand everything in  
16 Dr. Shamos's affidavit. I do not understand a lot of things in  
17 Dr. Martin's affidavit. So we start with the defendants  
18 already out in front because I understand what their expert is  
19 telling me, and I do not understand what the plaintiff's expert  
20 is telling me. It does not appear to be addressing what I  
21 asked to have addressed, but that's probably because I don't  
22 understand it. I just wanted to get that out there right at  
23 the beginning because I don't want anybody to be disadvantaged.  
24 You need to teach me. Okay?

25 You need to teach me, so it may be necessary, as a

ElfWdroH

1 result, for there to be a little more direct of Dr. Martin than  
2 I would otherwise have anticipated. I'm kind of confused.  
3 Dr. Shamos's affidavit is very straightforward. It's very  
4 understandable. It answers exactly the questions that I asked.  
5 Maybe Dr. Martin's does, too, but if it does, he does it in a  
6 way that I'm not getting.

7 That said, Mr. Reichman, the floor is yours.

8 MR. REICHMAN: Your Honor, if it would be helpful, I  
9 could make a few opening comments about where we're going.

10 THE COURT: That's fine.

11 MR. REICHMAN: It seems to me that, pursuant to your  
12 Honor's direction, there are two issues to talk about today.  
13 The first one is the one that you've already mentioned, going  
14 through the witness examinations so we can figure out what was  
15 allegedly disclaimed or what technologies that were disclaimed.

16 THE COURT: What was disclaimed? What was disclaimed  
17 in 2000, what was disclaimed in 2008 because you have a  
18 reexamination --

19 MR. REICHMAN: That's correct.

20 THE COURT: -- which, by the way, as far as I can  
21 tell, is not addressed in Dr. Martin's affidavit. Maybe I  
22 missed it. It's clearly addressed in Dr. Shamos's affidavit.

23 MR. REICHMAN: In addition, pursuant to your Honor's  
24 direction, we'll talk about the law regarding the scope of the  
25 disclaimer.

ElfWdroH

1           The focus of the hearing, as I understand it, is the  
2 proposed negative disclaimer or negative limitation about what  
3 an interactive link cannot be. It cannot be a list of  
4 different technologies.

5           THE COURT: Right.

6           MR. REICHMAN: I come at this from a point of view,  
7 your Honor, as you do, not being a technical person by training  
8 but coming to it as a lawyer, and I'm hopeful that today you're  
9 going to see Dr. Martin's testimony. We've got some graphics  
10 and it will explain it in a way that will be more interactive  
11 and a little more understandable.

12          THE COURT: If they're cartoons, I love cartoons.

13          MR. REICHMAN: We've got a couple cartoons.

14          THE COURT: Good. Very important.

15          MR. REICHMAN: He's going to focus on what was the  
16 state of the art in 1999, so focus on what this technology was  
17 capable of at the time at the time that this patent relates  
18 back to the provisional application to which the '745 patent  
19 relates, as filed in 1999. What he's going to explain, if you  
20 want to boil it down to its essence, is he's going to show why  
21 the technologies in question in 1999 did not have the  
22 facilities for restoring previous operating states, what I call  
23 the facilities clause, that's part of the Court's construction.

24          In this regard, the question today, I don't think, is  
25 what were these different technologies, URLs and the like,

ElfWdroH

1 what's the definition of them; I think the question is what was  
2 their functionality in 1999. In that regard, that's where I  
3 see the opposing declarations of the experts in this case  
4 missing each other or passing in the night in the sense that I  
5 think that Mr. Shamos's declaration is more focused on  
6 definitions, and you'll see the testimony today from Dr. Martin  
7 is more focused on what was the functionality of these  
8 technologies back in 1999.

9 You're going to hear the testimony that it didn't make  
10 any sense in '99 for URLs and the like, these technologies, to  
11 have facilities for restoring an operating state because you  
12 didn't have client side applications running from within  
13 browsers. It wouldn't have been necessary, it wouldn't have  
14 been appropriate, to have the facilities, facilities clause  
15 that we're talking about. URLs and the other technologies at  
16 issue did not, in 1999, facilitate the storage of operating  
17 states. The Web pages were static. There was no need to be  
18 facilitating the storage of these operating states.

19 But today, it's very different, and you'll hear  
20 testimony about that, your Honor. Today it's different. Today  
21 the technologies in question, URLs and the like, are part of  
22 the package that is facilitating the storage of operating  
23 states. And why is that? Because today, unlike in 1999,  
24 applications are running on the client side from within the  
25 browser, and we're going to show you examples of what we mean

E1fWdroH

1 by that. It's not going to be just words; it's going to be a  
2 graphic so you can see what we mean when we say applications  
3 are running from the browser. Because you're running these  
4 applications on the client side, now, today, it is necessary to  
5 facilitate the storage of the operating states. Today URLs and  
6 the like can be involved. They may not do the whole job, but  
7 they can be involved in facilitating storage on these operating  
8 states.

9 Again, this is where, I think, there is a disconnect  
10 between the experts. It's not a question, I don't think, and I  
11 think you'll hear Dr. Martin testify, it's not a question of  
12 definitions. I don't know that the definition of URLs and the  
13 like has changed since 1999. But what they do, what the  
14 technologies in question do, has certainly changed since 1999  
15 when the Internet itself was being invented. And I don't  
16 review Professor Shamos's declaration as saying that URLs,  
17 bookmarks, or the other technologies had facilities for  
18 restoring previous operating states in 1999, and if that ends  
19 up being the position, that's something that we dealt with at  
20 the invalidity stage of the case, which really brings me to the  
21 second point of my introductory comments, and that is the law  
22 relating to disclaimers.

23 I'm going to assume, absent other direction from the  
24 Court, that you don't want extensive argument at this point on  
25 the law, that we'll deal with that when we wrap up today, but

ElfWdroH

1 maybe I'll give you a two-minute preview of what we intend to  
2 argue.

3 I think our legal point, Droplets's legal point, boils  
4 down to the proposition that there isn't going to be a need,  
5 under the case law, for your Honor to adopt the proposed  
6 negative limitation. We think it's contrary to precedent, and  
7 that's precedent that does not favor negative limitations in  
8 the first place, and it's also contrary to the law regarding  
9 disclaimers. For there to be a disclaimer, the thing had to be  
10 claimed in the first place, and in this case, the URLs, as they  
11 existed in 1999, standing alone, there was never an allegation  
12 that those were in the four corners of the patent. Why not?  
13 Because they never facilitated the storage of previous  
14 operating states. They never had the facilities clause. So  
15 there was never within the claim, it was not disclaimed. It  
16 was merely distinguished.

17 The point of this is that there is no opportunity,  
18 there is no risk of recapture. It seems to me, in reading the  
19 Court's Markman rulings, there's a concern and a concern  
20 expressed in the defendants' briefing of what I call anyway  
21 recapture; that is, something that was distinguished as part of  
22 the prior art is not now being claimed as infringing. I think  
23 that the Court's construction and the bedrock principles of  
24 patent law protect against recapture. There is no realistic  
25 possibility of that happening in this case. And why? Because

ElfWdroH

1 the Court adopted the facilities clause, for starters,  
2 facilities for restoring the previous operating state. That's  
3 how the prior art was distinguished. If defendants come  
4 forward at the invalidity stage with prior art that it has the  
5 facilities for restoring the previous operating states and  
6 meets the limitations, then these patents are invalid, so it's  
7 game over at that point. But we don't think that we're going  
8 to see any testimony when it comes to the invalidity stage that  
9 these facilities were present in the prior art. That's how it  
10 was distinguished in the first place.

11                   So then is there an opportunity for recapture on  
12 infringement? No, because if what Droplets is accusing does  
13 not have the facilities for restoring the previous operating  
14 state, then there's no infringement, and, if it does, there is  
15 infringement. This is all dealt with in terms of bedrock  
16 principles of invalidity and infringement.

17                  THE COURT: Can I tell you something? You're right.  
18 You're cute, because we all know what the game is here. I've  
19 done this a hundred times now. The game is to get the claims  
20 defined in such a way that the issue of the infringement,  
21 particularly infringement, secondarily validity, is disposed  
22 of. I mean that's round one, to get the terms and the claims  
23 defined so that you can say, Hah, we have that, we don't have  
24 that, game over. We're out.

25                  You're trying to do it, too.

ElfWdroH

1                   MR. REICHMAN: Certainly the parties craft their  
2 positions with an eye towards invalidity and infringement.

3                   THE COURT: Right.

4                   MR. REICHMAN: But the case law is clear also though  
5 that the district court does not need to be looking at the  
6 claim construction with an eye towards those things.

7                   THE COURT: I'm always trying to figure out what the  
8 heck you guys are trying to do, how you're trying to bamboozle  
9 me into deciding the case when I don't know that I'm deciding  
10 the case. I'm not so unsophisticated as not to know that the  
11 game at this stage is to get me to decide the case without even  
12 knowing that I'm deciding the case. Okay? That's what claim  
13 construction is all about. That naive I'm not.

14                  MR. REICHMAN: That's part of the point that I'm  
15 trying to make about invalidity and infringement, to give the  
16 Court a view toward how this plays out in terms of invalidity  
17 and infringement.

18                  THE COURT: You just told me I should not have an eye  
19 to that, that the case law forbids me from doing that, so let's  
20 not talk about that. I want to define the term. I want to  
21 define the term, and the law tells me that when I define the  
22 term, I'm supposed to look at the prosecution history and I'm  
23 not supposed to define a term in a way that recaptures -- that  
24 is the correct word -- something that wasn't disclaimed in the  
25 prosecution history. That's all this is about.

ElfWdroH

1           That's all this is about. We're not going to discuss  
2 explicitly how whatever definition I adopt will advance it, one  
3 side or another, in the merits litigation. But I'm not a dope  
4 and I know perfectly well that one side or the other will be  
5 advantaged in the merits litigation, depending on how I come  
6 out. Okay? So fine, but I have to define the term.

7           MR. REICHMAN: That's right.

8           THE COURT: I have to define the disputed term. I  
9 don't have any choice. I do not choose to defer it because, as  
10 far as I'm concerned, we've got to get the definitions on the  
11 table so you know what you're litigating over.

12           MR. REICHMAN: I think that's right, your Honor, and  
13 the law that we'll talk about at the end in terms of what is  
14 the scope of a disclaimer, I submit, Droplets submits, that  
15 this is not within the law in terms of the scope of the  
16 disclaimer.

17           THE COURT: Great. That's your position. Now let's  
18 get to what we want to talk about today, which is this  
19 evidence.

20           MR. REICHMAN: At most, then, what you'll see in the  
21 evidence, the most that could be disclaimed, just as a matter  
22 of logic, is what existed in 1999: the technologies that were  
23 later created could not have been disclaimed.

24           Thank you, your Honor.

25           THE COURT: Let's get started. It's your nickel.

ElfWdroH

1 MR. BUDWIN: Your Honor, absent any guidance to the  
2 contrary, we would call Dr. David Martin.

3 THE COURT: I think that would be the best possible  
4 idea.

5 MR. BUDWIN: Come forward, please, Dr. Martin.

6 DAVID W. MARTIN,

7 called as a witness by the Plaintiff,

8 having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

9 THE COURT: First of all, I want to apologize to you  
10 for not understanding everything you have in there, but you'll  
11 explain it to me.

12 THE WITNESS: I can't see how that's your fault, your  
13 Honor.

14 DIRECT EXAMINATION

15 BY MR. BUDWIN:

16 Q. Good morning, Dr. Martin. It should be no surprise that  
17 you're here with plaintiff, Droplets, in this case, is that  
18 correct?

19 A. That's correct. Good morning.

20 Q. Dr. Martin, why are you here, as you understand it?

21 A. I'm here to testify about the term "interactive link" and  
22 the proposed disclaimer.

23 Q. Are you also prepared to give the Court a background and  
24 introduction into the technology?

25 A. Yes, I am.

ElfWdroH

Martin - direct

1 Q. In your opinion, should the defendants' proposed disclaimer  
2 be read in as a technological matter?

3 A. No.

4 Q. Before getting into the details of your opinion and the  
5 background of the technology, can you summarize at a high level  
6 why you've come to that opinion?

7 A. Yes. At a high level, the technologies that were  
8 distinguished in the prosecution history did not meet the  
9 construction of interactive link, specifically, the part about  
10 restoring operating states.

11 Q. When you refer to the construction of interactive link, you  
12 mean the core definition that the Court has already provided  
13 us?

14 A. That is correct.

15 MR. BUDWIN: Can we see slide two.

16 Q. We won't belabor this point, but can you just very quickly  
17 hit your expert qualifications?

18 A. Yes. I have almost 35 years' professional experience in  
19 software. I have a Ph.D. in computer science, and I've taught  
20 in computer science departments.

21 MR. BUDWIN: Can we advance the slide three, please.

22 Q. What is the core construction of the interactive link term  
23 that the Court has already provided us, what we see here. We  
24 don't have to read it.

25 A. Yes, sir. It's shown on the slide.

ElfWdroH

Martin - direct

1 Q. We see the first part of the definition retrieves and  
2 presents applications and/or information stored at remote  
3 locations across the network. Do you see that?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. Dr. Martin, is that a characteristic of all links,  
6 bookmarks, shortcuts, hyperlinks, and URLs, as those have  
7 existed throughout time?

8 A. I would say so, yes, for links that concern remote  
9 computers. Yes.

10 Q. Then the second part of this definition, this is what we've  
11 referred to as the facilities clause, provides, "Includes  
12 facilities for restoring previous operating states of the  
13 application," and that's the point, the application, "as the  
14 application is being re-presented at the user's computer.  
15 Would you agree or disagree that the second part of this core  
16 definition is a characteristic of all links, bookmarks,  
17 hyperlinks, URLs, shortcuts?

18 A. I would disagree. The second part is not a characteristic  
19 of all links.

20 Q. And why is that?

21 A. Simply because links, in the early days of the Web, could  
22 be used to retrieve and present information that had nothing to  
23 do with an application running in the Web browser, and so there  
24 was no operating state to consider.

25 THE COURT: Guess what? I don't understand what you

ElfWdroH

Martin - direct

1 just said. I know you're at a higher level, but since I don't  
2 want to be confused, I need to understand what you just said.

3 MR. BUDWIN: Your Honor, I promise that we're going to  
4 dive right into that in one second.

5 THE COURT: Please.

6 MR. BUDWIN: I was trying to give you an overview.

7 THE COURT: The overview is too over.

8 MR. BUDWIN: Let's advance forward. Let's take a look  
9 at some of the background of the Web and then we'll come back  
10 and summarize some of this.

11 Q. Dr. Martin, you prepared some slides to help explain the  
12 evolution of technology on the Web and help answer the specific  
13 question that the Court's directed to us?

14 A. Yes, I have.

15 MR. BUDWIN: Can we advance to slide eight, please,  
16 Mr. Quigley.

17 Q. What are you showing us here, Dr. Martin?

18 A. I'm showing the cover page from a book called Ajax, the  
19 definitive guide by O'Reilly press.

20 Q. Is this one of the books cited in the briefing by the  
21 parties?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. Does this book provide a high-level example of how the Web  
24 has evolved from 2000 until more recently and how that change  
25 in operating state is key in something that came in 2005 and

ElfWdroH

Martin - direct

1 later.

2 A. Yes, it does.

3 Q. Are you prepared to walk us through the examples in this  
4 book?

5 A. Yes, I am.

6 MR. BUDWIN: Let's go to slide nine.

7 Q. What are we seeing here, Dr. Martin?

8 A. What we're seeing here is a screen shot of the MapQuest Web  
9 site as it existed in 2000. MapQuest was a Web site that  
10 allowed people to, say, enter an address and it would compute a  
11 map and show the map within a Web browser.

12 Q. Something people familiarly and frequently use on the Web  
13 then and now?

14 A. That's correct.

15 THE COURT: You've picked one that I use.

16 BY MR. BUDWIN:

17 Q. Did the MapQuest, in 2000, have links, hyperlinks, and  
18 URLs?

19 A. Yes. You can see some on the screen. The big buttons, for  
20 instance, are hyperlinks.

21 Q. Could you save a bookmark or create a shortcut?

22 THE COURT: What do you mean the big buttons?

23 THE WITNESS: For instance, in the right lower  
24 left-hand column of the screen shot -- yes, thank you.

25 Can you see the cursor moving?

ElfWdroH

Martin - direct

1                   THE COURT: Under special interests?

2                   THE WITNESS: Yes. Those would be the hyperlinks.

3 Other material on the page, pretty much every independent text  
4 block on the page, is probably a hyperlink.

5                   THE COURT: Thank you.

6 BY MR. BUDWIN:

7 Q. Could you save a bookmark or create a shortcut to a  
8 MapQuest page in 2000?

9 A. Yes. Web browsers at that time allowed users to save  
10 bookmarks.

11 Q. Does the MapQuest as it exists today work in the same way  
12 as it did in 2000?

13 A. Actually, no, it doesn't.

14 Q. Is that change relevant to the issue that you've been asked  
15 to address today?

16 A. I think so, yes.

17 Q. I want to take one step back and I want to look at one of  
18 the claims at issue in this case --

19                   MR. BUDWIN: And, Mr. Quigley, if we could see slide  
20 five.

21 Q. -- what are you showing us here, Dr. Martin?

22 A. We're looking at claim one in the upper left-hand corner  
23 and we see the highlighting beginning with client computer and  
24 further on having computer code embedded therein.

25 Q. Do we also see claim 41?

ElfWdroH

Martin - direct

1 A. Yes, and 41 in the lower right-hand corner, which also  
2 concerns the client computer, the application presented on the  
3 client computer, and how that information is delivered there.

4 Q. These are some of the claims that are being asserted in  
5 this case?

6 A. Yes, sir.

7 Q. Why are you showing us these claims? Why is it relevant to  
8 the discussion that we're getting ready to have about the  
9 MapQuest application and how it changed from 2000 to 2005?

10 A. These claims talk about the application being presented on  
11 the client computer. So I think what we need to visualize here  
12 is that there is some active program that runs on the client  
13 computer that's doing work for the user, as opposed to the 1999  
14 state of the art in which a Web browser just showed views of  
15 information that was stored strictly at a Web server.

16 THE COURT: Wait. This is from the patent, right, the  
17 original? So this is like a 1999 document, is it not?

18 MR. BUDWIN: This is the asserted claims.

19 THE COURT: The asserted claim.

20 MR. BUDWIN: In the '745 patent.

21 THE COURT: The patent was allowed in, what, 2000?

22 MR. BUDWIN: I don't have the exact date.

23 THE COURT: This document dates from around 1999, does  
24 it not?

25 MR. BUDWIN: The provisional filing was 1999.

ElfWdroH

Martin - direct

1                   THE COURT: Provisional filing was in 1999. Okay.

2                   MR. BUDWIN: Correct.

3                   THE COURT: This language was created in 1999, so I  
4 don't understand why you're asking him to distinguish what was  
5 available in 1999 from this language, which is 1999 language,  
6 as I understand it.

7                   MR. BUDWIN: Your Honor, what we're going to endeavor  
8 to show you is that the Web, in 1999 and 2000, worked in a  
9 paradigm where the Web browser on the user's computer, all that  
10 Web browser was capable of is displaying a page.

11                  THE COURT: Right.

12                  MR. BUDWIN: Display, that was it. That was all it  
13 did. In 2005 and later, there was a fundamental shift in  
14 technology on the Web where now what you actually have  
15 delivered to your client computer is an application, so the Web  
16 server, instead of merely sending pages that your browser  
17 blindly displays the content of, what you're going to see is a  
18 shift where the Web server is now delivering to your client  
19 computer an application, and that application is going to run  
20 in part on your client computer and in part on the server, and  
21 the reason we're showing the claim language here is this is  
22 what the invention claims.

23                  The invention is claiming what would be called a  
24 distributed application, an application that's running in part  
25 on the client computer and in part on the server computer, and

ElfWdroH

Martin - direct

1 that's why in particular we've emphasized the language from  
2 claim 41 here. Claim 41, which is one of the asserted claims,  
3 talks about updating the display on the client using what's  
4 called net change information. So instead of merely refreshing  
5 the page, there's a small, think about MapQuest and this is  
6 what we're going to walk through. You move the map one iota  
7 over, what would happen in 2000, the whole page would be  
8 redrawn and delivered from the server.

9           What happens today is only that small part of the page  
10 is updated because you have this dynamic interactive real time  
11 update, and the reason that's important is because when you  
12 have a distributed application, like this patent claims and  
13 like what became common on the Web after 2005, now you have to  
14 preserve operating state information on both the client and the  
15 server. You've always preserved operating state on the server.

16           THE COURT: Okay.

17           MR. BUDWIN: We'll get to that.

18           THE COURT: All right.

19           MR. BUDWIN: We're going to walk through this.

20           THE COURT: Okay.

21           MR. BUDWIN: Mr. Quigley, could we go back to slide  
22 nine. What we're seeing here is just the MapQuest as it looked  
23 in 2000; it's got links, hyperlinks, you could create bookmarks  
24 and shortcuts.

25 Q. Dr. Martin, this page that we're seeing here in 2000, how

ElfWdroH

Martin - direct

1 did this work? Did this work like the invention that's being  
2 claimed in the patent, or did it work differently?

3 A. This worked differently, as I explained. This is a simple  
4 view of a document that's generated at the server and sent back  
5 to the Web browser.

6 Q. Do we have to take your word for it, or does this book  
7 actually make the exact point that we're going to endeavor to  
8 make here?

9 A. The text of the book describes the details of the old site  
10 and the new technologies as well and how we improved it.

11 MR. BUDWIN: Could we have the next slide, please,  
12 Mr. Quigley.

13 Q. There's a lot of text here. There's a lot of highlighting.  
14 I'm going to read just a little bit of it, and then maybe you  
15 can help us describe a little bit. It says here that, in 2000,  
16 MapQuest worked the same as all other Internet sites at the  
17 time. You click on a link or a search button and you're taken  
18 to a new page that had to be completely redrawn. Is that  
19 consistent with the description I just provided to the Court  
20 about the application not running on the client?

21 A. Yes, it is. And that is how the site worked at the time.

22 Q. And it says here you change the zoom factor, you move that  
23 any direction, you get this round trip to the server that upon  
24 return caused the whole page to refresh. That's what we're  
25 describing?

ElfWdroH

Martin - direct

1 A. That's correct.

2 Q. Then if we look a little bit further down the page, I  
3 believe it's on this page --

4 MR. BUDWIN: Mr. Quigley, you may have to check; it  
5 may break to the next page, the next slide.

6 Q. -- it says what you really need to know about MapQuest and  
7 all Web sites in general at the time, this is 2000, is that for  
8 every user request for data, the client would need to make a  
9 round trip to the server to get information, a completely new  
10 page had to be loaded into the browser. This was extremely  
11 frustrating, but this is how everything was done on the  
12 Internet back then. As the text says, it was the only way to  
13 do things.

14 MR. BUDWIN: Could we see the next slide, please,  
15 Mr. Quigley.

16 Q. Dr. Martin, can you explain what this is showing us, this  
17 graphic is showing us, from the textbook?

18 A. Yes. This illustration is attempting to show the click,  
19 wait, and refresh style of the old Web. And what we see on the  
20 left column, we see the Web browser, the client computer, over  
21 time, and it's trying to show that in the first upper left-hand  
22 corner view, a Web page is visible when a user does anything  
23 like move the map slightly to one direction, that requires a  
24 request being sent to the server. That's the top arrow going  
25 to the right.

ElfWdroH

Martin - direct

1 Q. Can you speak slowly, too?

2 A. Sorry. Thank you.

3 So the request is sent to the server that's labeled page  
4 request one and sent to the right. The server then computes  
5 the page, the new map, and sends it in response to the client.  
6 And then if the client clicks again, then the same process has  
7 to happen, and it's shown here three different times.

8 Q. What is it that the user is clicking on or interacting  
9 with, links, hyperlinks, URLs, things of that nature?

10 A. Yes. The user can click on a hyperlink or click on an  
11 arrow to move the map slightly, for instance.

12 THE COURT: That's a link.

13 THE WITNESS: That is a link, yes.

14 BY MR. BUDWIN:

15 Q. As this is describing, when a user is clicking an arrow or  
16 link to move the map a little bit, we have this process where  
17 the whole page is being redrawn?

18 A. That's correct.

19 Q. In this example, would you characterize the browser as  
20 running a portion of the MapQuest application?

21 A. No, I wouldn't. I would say that the browser is a viewing  
22 portal for maps that are generated on the server in the right  
23 column, and it actually shows that there is no client  
24 application with operating state running on the Web browser  
25 computer.

ElfWdroH

Martin - direct

1 Q. Now, you've told us before, that MapQuest doesn't work like  
2 this today?

3 A. Correct.

4 MR. BUDWIN: And we can advance to the next slide.

5 Q. What is this telling us? When did the evolution and the  
6 way that these sites worked from being what I would call server  
7 centric to being distributed across a client and server? When  
8 did that generally take place, as you understand it?

9 A. That took place in the mid-2000s, and I agree with the text  
10 here, that Google Maps, which was a competitor to MapQuest, was  
11 the first big deployment of this technology.

12 MR. BUDWIN: Can we advance to the next slide,  
13 Mr. Quigley.

14 Q. What is this showing us, Dr. Martin?

15 A. Well, this is a modern version of the MapQuest Web page  
16 using the new technology, and if you look at it now, it really  
17 doesn't look any different than the old, but it behaves  
18 differently underneath.

19 Q. How does it behave differently? Do you have some slides  
20 that explain that?

21 A. I do.

22 MR. BUDWIN: Can we advance again.

23 Q. What are you showing us here, Dr. Martin? What is the  
24 textbook, and what can you tell us about how a MapQuest has  
25 changed between 2000 and 2005?

ElfWdroH

Martin - direct

1 A. What's attempting to be illustrated here is that the user  
2 is still clicking in order to change the map, say, to scroll it  
3 to the right or to the left. But rather than having the map  
4 newly regenerated each time, what we see are these embedded  
5 arrows. They're labeled XHR request 1, 2, and so on. Those  
6 are smaller requests that are sent by the client application  
7 running on the Web browser computer. Those are smaller  
8 requests that just say, Hey, I need another block of  
9 information in this map. You don't have to redraw the whole  
10 thing, just give me the new material. And so one of those XHR  
11 requests is sent to the right, the server computes just the new  
12 material, and sends only the new material back to the client  
13 application. That's the MapQuest.

14 THE COURT: But that happens on the server, not on the  
15 client. The client computer is still essentially a display  
16 mechanism; it just now has the ability to ask not for a whole  
17 redraw of the page but, Could you please redraw the upper  
18 left-hand corner of the page?

19 THE WITNESS: Generally, yes. In this scenario,  
20 that's what the client application is doing. It's just asking  
21 for a small update to the information on the page.

22 THE COURT: But how is that fundamentally different?  
23 It's still asking the server at the remote location to do that,  
24 to do the redrawing. It just says redraw less. How is that  
25 fundamentally different?

ElfWdroH

Martin - direct

1                 THE WITNESS: I think the difference is that you  
2 actually have part of the application running on the client  
3 now, and the term that we're discussing has to do with whether  
4 it's possible to restore operating states of an application.  
5 Now we have an application that's actually running on the  
6 client, and it makes sense to talk about its operating state.

7                 Now, this example, I agree, is just improving the  
8 efficiency of the previous map.

9                 THE COURT: That's what it sounds like all it's doing.  
10 It's going to take less time for the server at the remote  
11 location to get back to the screen what you want to see because  
12 you're only asking it to redraw a little bit of the map, not  
13 the entire thing. Maybe I'm not understanding what it is  
14 that's happening at the client computer.

15                 MR. BUDWIN: Your Honor, we have another example that  
16 we can show of a live Web page that may help illustrate this,  
17 but the key, the key point, is now, instead of the browser  
18 merely displaying a document that's generated by the server, on  
19 the client computer, part of the application is actually  
20 running. It's not just displaying a page that's drawn by the  
21 server. The client computer actually has logic and is doing  
22 processing.

23                 THE COURT: You can't tell that from this example.

24                 MR. BUDWIN: So let's talk about one of the examples  
25 that Dr. Shamos used in his declaration, which is the Yahoo!

ElfWdroH

Martin - direct

1 stock chart example. Why don't we jump forward to that and  
2 let's walk through that. Mr. Quigley, can we jump forward to  
3 slide 25.

4 Q. Dr. Martin, what are you showing us here on slide 25? And  
5 before we get into this, what is operating? We're talking  
6 about operating state, saying it's important now the  
7 application's distributed. What is the operating state, and  
8 maybe use your MapQuest example to explain that?

9 A. Sure. Look, an application can do many different things,  
10 and the operating state is what determines what the application  
11 is doing at one instant rather than the full spectrum of things  
12 that it can do. So for the MapQuest example, an operating  
13 state might be the particular neighborhood that it's generating  
14 a map of. This is something you might want to write down so  
15 that later you can return to the same map segment.

16 Q. And in the old way of doing the map where the map is being  
17 entirely drawn by the server, do you need to preserve operating  
18 state with links and URLs and shortcuts that are on the client?

19 A. You might want to be able to regenerate those graphs later  
20 from the server, but in the absence of a client application  
21 running, it doesn't make sense to talk about storing the  
22 client's application state.

23 Q. Let's step forward to Dr. Shamos's Yahoo! example. What  
24 are you showing us here on this slide?

25 A. This is going to be, I think, a three-, or four-slide

ElfWdroH

Martin - direct

1 sequence. It's a little technical here, but basically, I want,  
2 I'm trying to illustrate the old way that things worked, the  
3 flow from the client to the server, and what the server does as  
4 a result, and it also defines a couple of terms that have come  
5 up so far; namely, the query string and the URL.

6 Q. We see at the top of the page something labeled URL.

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. That's a uniform research locator. It's a link, could be a  
9 shortcut. It's an address of something on the Internet?

10 A. Yes, and this could be the result of someone clicking on  
11 something leads to this URL being used to generate a display.  
12 So what happens then when the client's Web browser wants to  
13 display this URL is the entire URL is analyzed and broken up  
14 into pieces. The part I've colored red that follows the  
15 question mark and labeled query string is simply part of the  
16 URL that communicates information to the Web server, and in  
17 this example, the query string is saying please generate a  
18 graph of the NASDAQ index over time.

19 Q. That's what the IXIC is, that's the ticker for NASDAQ?

20 A. That's right. That refers to NASDAQ. And then there's  
21 also a time frame specified here, T equals 3M, that's within  
22 the query string and that says I want a range of a three-month  
23 graph.

24 Q. This is an example of Yahoo! as it worked in '97, as  
25 Dr. Shamos says in his declaration, '99, and they even still

ElfWdroH

Martin - direct

1 have pages that work like this today?

2 A. That's correct. In fact, this is a URL that still works  
3 today using the old technology. Yahoo! just happens to provide  
4 the old technology Web site even today.

5 Q. So when a user enters this URL or clicks a link that has  
6 this address, what happens?

7 MR. BUDWIN: Could we advance to the next slide.

8 A. So the URL, most of the URL is sent to the Yahoo! Web  
9 server on the right here, and I'm showing on this slide simply  
10 that the Web server has received the URL and it needs to create  
11 a graph of NASDAQ over time, so it creates that graph and sends  
12 it back to the Web browser --

13 MR. BUDWIN: Next slide, please.

14 A. -- as a completed Web page with the graph and with all the  
15 other buttons and hyperlinks that belong on the Web page.

16 Q. You actually made a video that illustrates how this process  
17 works?

18 A. Yes, I have.

19 Q. Can you show that to us and walk us through it?

20 A. Let's give it a try.

21 Q. We may have to pause the view a couple times to make sure  
22 we keep up.

23 A. Here we go. I'm launching the Web browser now, and I  
24 have --

25 MR. BUDWIN: Can you pause it.

ElfWdroH

Martin - direct

1 Q. What do we see?

2 A. What we see is the Web browser simply having been launched,  
3 and I'm about to click on a bookmark. It's hard to read, but  
4 this is just a bookmark that goes to the Web site I was just  
5 discussing, the finance Yahoo! Web site.

6 Q. So you've created a bookmark that has the URL that you  
7 showed in the prior example, the three-month NASDAQ graph?

8 A. That's correct.

9 Q. You're going to click on that URL and now we're going to  
10 see what happens?

11 A. Right.

12 MR. BUDWIN: Please advance the video.

13 A. So the graph is constructed by the Web server and then  
14 delivered to the Web browser.

15 Q. Correct.

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. In its entirety?

18 A. In its entirety.

19 MR. BUDWIN: If we advance the video further --

20 A. I guess we rewound the video a bit so there's a little bit  
21 of a repeat here. So now I'm just moving the mouse pointer,  
22 showing the contour of the line. It kind of doesn't do  
23 anything. It's not a very live chart, but here I'm clicking on  
24 a different range. I'm saying --

25 MR. BUDWIN: Please pause that, Mr. Quigley.

ElfWdroH

Martin - direct

1 A. I just clicked on, I know it's hard to read here, but --

2 THE COURT: Six months.

3 THE WITNESS: Six months, right.

4 A. And let's do another one. You may have seen when I clicked  
5 on six months, the entire screen was erased and then redrawn  
6 with the new graph. I'll do this again here if we just go --

7 MR. BUDWIN: Slide back a little bit and then play it  
8 again.

9 Q. Go ahead. See that white flash? Is that indicative of a  
10 page being redrawn, that white flash, Dr. Martin?

11 A. That is what I was discussing. Yes.

12 THE COURT: So long, that must have taken at least  
13 like a tenth of a second.

14 Q. So what we're seeing here is using the older technology,  
15 the browser's just displaying the chart on the page as that  
16 whole page and that whole chart is being generated by the  
17 server?

18 A. That's correct.

19 MR. BUDWIN: Let's advance the video further.

20 A. The next thing that I did was try to show how the Web  
21 browser is just a portal on to the Web server, showing what the  
22 Web server creates, and it has no independent application  
23 ability itself.

24 MR. BUDWIN: Pause it.

25 Q. Why is it important whether the application as it's running

ElfWdroH

Martin - direct

1 on the client, or why is it important if there is an  
2 application running on the client or not?

3 A. Again, we're talking about the ability to restore operating  
4 states of an application that runs on a client.

5 Q. In this example, is there an application running on the  
6 client?

7 A. No. This is the old technology.

8 Q. You're going to show even further illustration of why  
9 that's the case.

10 MR. BUDWIN: Go ahead. Push forward.

11 A. That's correct. So what I've done now is I have unplugged  
12 the network connection and now I'm going to click on one of  
13 these hyperlinks.

14 THE COURT: What do you mean you've unplugged the  
15 network connection?

16 THE WITNESS: I mean it's actually taking the network  
17 link and turning it off so the computer that I'm making a video  
18 of here is not able to talk to any other computers now,  
19 including the Web server.

20 BY MR. BUDWIN:

21 Q. You've broken the connection between the client and the  
22 server?

23 A. That's correct.

24 MR. BUDWIN: This is going to be a test, your Honor,  
25 so we can see whether or not there is an application running on

ElfWdroH

Martin - direct

1 the client side or not.

2 Advance it and let's see what happens. I need a new  
3 graphics guy.

4 THE COURT: Basically, what you're going to do is  
5 you're going to click like 12 months, or something, and  
6 nothing's going to happen because you're not connected to the  
7 Internet.

8 MR. BUDWIN: Correct. And you don't have any portion  
9 of the application that's running on the client, so there's no  
10 need to preserve session state because there is no application  
11 running on the client.

12 Q. Now, do you have another example, just like MapQuest, as to  
13 how this same technology works using this distributed  
14 application claim type claimed by the claims where you have  
15 this need to preserve session state, operating state?

16 A. Yes, I do.

17 MR. BUDWIN: Now, can we advance to the next slide.

18 Q. Dr. Martin, what are we seeing here?

19 A. This is the three-, or four-slide explanation of the video  
20 that we'll see afterwards, and it shows the new technology.

21 Q. Let me stop you. I see at the top a URL similar to the one  
22 that we saw before.

23 A. Yes, it's not exactly the same, but it's similar.

24 Q. It's a URL?

25 A. Yes.

ElfWdroH

Martin - direct

1                   THE COURT: It's definitely a URL.

2 BY MR. BUDWIN:

3 Q. And you could have a link or a shortcut or a bookmark to  
4 this URL?

5 A. Yes, you could.

6 Q. And then looking here, I see you've labeled a box query  
7 string.

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. And within that query string, I see the EIXIC, that's the  
10 same NASDAQ index?

11 A. Yes, it is.

12 Q. Except now I see plus interactive?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. And so is this going to be a different example than what we  
15 saw before?

16 A. Yes, it is.

17 Q. And at the very far end of this, you labeled something as a  
18 fragment identifier. What is the portion of the fragment  
19 identifier?

20 A. The fragment identifier starts with the green sharp symbol  
21 and it includes all the text including symbol equals and range  
22 equals.

23                   THE COURT: What does that mean?

24                   THE WITNESS: The fragment identifier is going to be  
25 used by the application that now actually is running on the

ElfWdroH

Martin - direct

1 client to figure out how much of the NASDAQ graph to actually  
2 display to the user.

3 BY MR. BUDWIN:

4 Q. I see you have this computer on the left and the Yahoo!  
5 server on the right, and I see there's a get in the middle.  
6 What does that illustrate?

7 A. This is showing the client again sending a request to the  
8 Web server, but it's requesting an application now, not merely  
9 a Web page. It's requesting an application.

10 Q. And then I see you show below the client computer, you say  
11 this portion of fragment identifier, see that, is not sent?  
12 Why is that important?

13 A. It's important because what is going to be delivered back  
14 to the client is an application that is going to look at this  
15 green fragment identifier, and the application will decide what  
16 range is appropriate to display to the user based on the user's  
17 initial request. In fact, the Web server in this scenario  
18 never even knows what date range is being shown to the user.

19 Q. Is it possible or would it be fair to characterize at least  
20 some query strings of the type that you've shown here as being  
21 operating state information for the application as it exists on  
22 the server?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. But, is it important in this example in contrast to the  
25 prior example and in a context of the distributed application

ElfWdroH

Martin - direct

1 claimed in the patents at issue here that a portion of the  
2 fragment identifier that's maintained on the client, why is  
3 that important?

4 A. It's important because the fragment identifier is a good  
5 place to store operating state information about the client  
6 application simply because it is always maintained on the  
7 client. It's never even sent to the server.

8 MR. BUDWIN: Can we advance to the next slide.

9 Q. That's what you're endeavoring to show here: now, in this  
10 example, the application, as it runs in the client, it's  
11 remembering part of the information in that URL or that  
12 shortcut?

13 A. That's correct.

14 Q. And that's operating state information for part of the  
15 application running on the client?

16 A. That's right.

17 Q. But if we look at what's happening on the server, what is  
18 the server doing now, Dr. Martin?

19 A. The server now constructs this interactive application that  
20 it's going to deliver.

21 Q. Let me stop you there.

22 MR. BUDWIN: Why don't we go ahead and advance to the  
23 next slide.

24 Q. You're saying it's constructing an application. How is  
25 constructing an application different from what we saw in the

ElfWdroH

Martin - direct

1 prior example where the server's constructing a page with a  
2 static GIF or JPEG image that shows the stock quote?

3 A. The difference is in the prior version, the Web page that's  
4 generated really just has images and text and layout  
5 information in it.

6 Q. I see, if I look at the page that you're showing being sent  
7 back here, there's actually no stock ticker or graph being  
8 displayed. That's different from the prior example.

9 A. That's correct. In the modern example, the graph isn't  
10 generated at the server. Rather, the server sends a program, a  
11 client application, that is capable of constructing the graph  
12 on the client computer.

13 Q. Is that what you're showing here on the next slide?

14 A. That's correct.

15 Q. What is happening now once this application, once that's  
16 received by the client, what's the client doing with that  
17 application?

18 A. When received by the client, the client runs this  
19 application and looks at this green fragment identifier, sees  
20 the one-day date range, and it knows that it needs to construct  
21 the graph. And so it constructs this graph and it puts it on  
22 the Web browser making it visible, and then it continues  
23 running, watching what the user is doing, to see if the user  
24 wants to change anything on the graph.

25 Q. So now, do we actually have logic running on the client in

ElfWdroH

Martin - direct

1 addition to logic running on the server that's going to  
2 process, interpret, and update the display for the user without  
3 having to make any queries to the server at all?

4 A. That's correct.

5 Q. Is that important?

6 A. Yes, that is important.

7 Q. Why?

8 A. Because, again, this means that much of the computing  
9 burden of generating these graphs is now borne by the  
10 individual users. Okay? This is, makes it much easier to run  
11 the Yahoo! servers because they don't have to construct the  
12 graphs; they just have to send graphing applications to users.  
13 So that's a benefit to Yahoo!.

14 Q. Why is that important in the context of the specific  
15 question that you're being asked to address today, which is  
16 whether or not the capabilities and functionalities -- links  
17 and URLs and hyperlinks and shortcuts -- have evolved from 1999  
18 until today?

19 A. Again, back to the client application running, since the  
20 application is running here, it makes sense to want to record  
21 its operating state; namely, what is being graphed and what the  
22 range of that graph should be. Okay? And so that operating  
23 state is visible in the URL as part of the fragment identifier  
24 and can be bookmarked.

25 Q. Do you have another video that shows this example or kind

ElfWdroH

Martin - direct

1 of contrasts it somewhat to the prior one?

2 A. Yes, I do.

3 Q. Again, let's just walk through this slowly. What are we  
4 seeing, Dr. Martin?

5 A. This will look initially very similar to the previous  
6 example, but this uses the modern technology. So I clicked on  
7 the new link, and we will see a brief pause and a graph  
8 appears. It's been constructed by the client application, and  
9 now if we continue, I'm going to move my mouse pointer around  
10 on the graph. You can see there's a small dot that follows the  
11 mouse pointer and there's a number that tracks the dot in the  
12 upper left. It's a little small. So that's showing the client  
13 application doing something. And now I'm going to, as before,  
14 disconnect from the network. It's no longer able to talk --

15 Q. Sorry. Why are you disconnecting from the Internet, and  
16 what is that going to prove?

17 THE COURT: Because you asked him to.

18 I know what it's going to prove. It's going to prove  
19 that there's going to be a change that is going to be made on  
20 this graph, even though he's no longer connected to the  
21 network, that something's happening on the client computer.

22 MR. BUDWIN: Right. Part of the application is  
23 running on the client.

24 THE COURT: That I got.

25 MR. BUDWIN: Advance.

ElfWdroH

Martin - direct

1                   THE COURT: So disconnect, press the button, and  
2 update the graph.

3                   THE WITNESS: Exactly. That's exactly what we'll see  
4 here. We're disconnected, as shown in the lower right-hand  
5 corner. You can still click and change the date range. Again,  
6 just shows that a client application is now running. So that's  
7 the essential difference between the old and the new.

8 BY MR. BUDWIN:

9 Q. And now because this client application is running on the  
10 client in part, what does that mean about operating state?

11 A. That means that it's relevant to store the operating state  
12 of the client application because we have a client application.

13 Q. Now, we can all agree or disagree about how evolutionary  
14 this change in the Web was. I mean, I think if you look at the  
15 relevant commentators --

16                  MR. BUDWIN: And, Mr. Quigley, can hold up the Ajax  
17 book in front of him.

18 Q. -- it's all about this. This is a thick book. This is a  
19 big change that fundamentally happens in the mid-2000s, and  
20 that change is fundamental to the conventions that are claimed  
21 here.

22                  MR. BUDWIN: If we can go to slide 14, back to the  
23 claim language, this is where -- sorry. Slide 15. Back to the  
24 claim language. This is where we have to look to see what the  
25 invention is that's being claimed.

ElfWdroH

Martin - direct

1 Q. Dr. Martin, in light of the example that you gave us of  
2 MapQuest and Yahoo! and looking at the language, the first part  
3 of the language of claim one, can you explain how those  
4 examples are relevant to the claim language and whether the old  
5 systems -- did old systems read on claim one?

6 A. No, they don't, because the old systems don't have computer  
7 program code embedded that arise at the client. That's  
8 referring to the client side of the application.

9 Q. If we look at claim 41, this is the claim that talks about  
10 using the net change information. Did the old Yahoo! and  
11 MapQuest read on claim 41?

12 A. No, for the same reasons.

13 Q. Again, would a modern Web application where part of the  
14 processing is borne, part of the application is on the client,  
15 is that germane? Does that fall within the type of  
16 architecture invention set forth in claim one and claim 41?

17 A. Yes. It's relevant and it potentially would satisfy these  
18 highlighted limitations.

19 Q. So that's why this change is relevant in the state of the  
20 art because now we have these client server applications as  
21 opposed server-centric applications?

22 A. That's correct.

23 Q. Dr. Martin, with that background, I'd like to advance and  
24 ask you some questions about the specific prior art that was in  
25 prosecution because the patentees are distinguishing specific

ElfWdroH

Martin - direct

1 pieces of art, and it's what the patentees had to say about the  
2 capabilities of those specific pieces of prior art. That's  
3 what's relevant to the scope of the alleged disclaimer and  
4 whether or not there's recapture. That's my statement; you  
5 don't have to agree with that.

6 MR. BUDWIN: Let's take a look at slide 16.

7 Q. This is the Gish patent. This is one of the pieces of  
8 prior art that was being discussed in prosecution?

9 A. That's correct.

10 Q. And we can see a date at the top, June 16, 1998, filing  
11 date of '96. Before we get into the meat of the issue, there's  
12 another reference called ICE-T that's been talked about?

13 MR. BUDWIN: Next slide.

14 Q. High-level overview, ICE-T user guide '96. Is there a  
15 relationship between the Gish patent in slide 16 and the ICE-T  
16 system that we see in slide 17?

17 A. Yes. They both describe the same invention. Gish is the  
18 patent and ICE-T is simply a user's guide.

19 Q. Let's advance a little bit. We're going to talk about Gish  
20 and ICE-T together, if that's okay with you, Dr. Martin, since  
21 they're similar or the same.

22 A. Yes.

23 MR. BUDWIN: Slide 18, please, Mr. Quigley.

24 Q. What is, at the highest level, the Gish patent and the Gish  
25 system? What is it about?

ElfWdroH

Martin - direct

1 A. The Gish invention provides a way to create client server  
2 applications that run over the Internet.

3 Q. So at a high level, how is the system described in Gish and  
4 ICE-T different from the inventions claimed in the '745 patent  
5 and in particular some of the claims, one and 41, that we've  
6 shown the Court?

7 A. One relevant difference is that Gish does not describe any  
8 mechanism for restoring previous operating states of an  
9 application.

10 Q. That's the second part of the Court's core definition of  
11 the interactive link term?

12 A. That's right.

13 Q. Do Gish and ICE-T discuss links as that technology existed  
14 in 1998?

15 A. Yes, they do. We can see a reference to a link on the  
16 slide 18.

17 Q. No surprise that links were in the prior art in 1998?

18 A. No.

19 Q. Not disputing that the Gish patent and ICE-T reference  
20 discuss links as they existed?

21 A. No.

22 MR. BUDWIN: If we could see slide three, Mr. Quigley.

23 Q. This is back to the Court's core definition, rooted in the  
24 claims and the parts of the construction that we've already  
25 received. Did the links discussed in Gish and ICE-T meet the

ElfWdroH

Martin - direct

1 first part of the Court's core definition of interactive link?

2 A. Yes, they would.

3 Q. Why is that?

4 A. Because the hyperlinks discussed in Gish are able to  
5 retrieve and present information stored at remote locations  
6 across the network when selected.

7 Q. Now, would the links in Gish and ICE-T meet the facilities  
8 clause, the second part of the Court's core construction of the  
9 interactive link term?

10 A. No, it wouldn't. Because, as I said, there is no  
11 application operating state to restore described in Gish.

12 Q. And so the fact that Gish and ICE-T failed to meet the  
13 second part of the Court's construction of interactive link  
14 shows that no additional disclaimer, at least as to those  
15 references, is warranted. That's my statement; you don't have  
16 to accept that. It's a legal statement.

17 MR. BUDWIN: Let's advance to the Dickman reference,  
18 which is another of the pieces of prior art that's being  
19 discussed, and this is slide 19.

20 Q. What's the date on the Dickman patent?

21 A. March 2, 1999.

22 Q. Can you tell us a bit about the system being claimed by  
23 Dickman?

24 A. Yes. The invention of Dickman was to describe simply a new  
25 place to store a bookmark. Previously, bookmarks were stored

ElfWdroH

Martin - direct

1 strictly within the Web browser and Dickman says, Hey, you can  
2 actually take the bookmark and store it outside of the Web  
3 browser as well.

4 Q. If we look at the abstract here, there's a reference to URL  
5 and there's a reference to an Internet shortcut?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. So, again, no surprise that those technologies existed or  
8 were discussed in the prior art?

9 A. Right.

10 Q. So at a high level, how is it that the invention in Dickman  
11 is different from what's being claimed by the patents at issue  
12 in this case?

13 A. Again, the difference is that Dickman does not describe  
14 applications running on the client. It simply describes links  
15 and where the links are going to be stored. So without  
16 describing applications, there's no need to be concerned with  
17 storing the application operating state.

18 Q. If we go back to the Court's core definition of the  
19 interactive link term in slide three, would the URLs and the  
20 shortcuts that are discussed in Dickman meet the first part of  
21 the Court's core definition?

22 A. Yes, they would.

23 Q. Why is that?

24 A. Because, as hyperlinks, they're able to retrieve and  
25 present information stored at remote locations.

ElfWdroH

Martin - direct

1 Q. Would the URLs and the shortcuts that are being talked  
2 about in the Dickman reference meet the second part of the  
3 Court's core construction of the interactive link term?

4 A. No, they wouldn't, because there is no description of  
5 applications, and at that time there were no client side  
6 applications that could be invoked using links.

7 MR. BUDWIN: Again, I would just make a statement --

8 THE COURT: You don't have to make a statement.

9 MR. BUDWIN: Let's talk about the next slide.

10 THE COURT: Let's not. Do me a favor. I have a  
11 criminal matter that is going to take about eight minutes, but  
12 I have a whole bunch of people sitting in the back and I'd like  
13 to get them out of here, as the billable hours are starting to  
14 run. Why don't we take a ten-minute break and let me deal with  
15 this criminal matter.

16 (Recess)

17 (In open court)

18 THE COURT: You're still under oath.

19 MR. BUDWIN: We need to go back. I realized I started  
20 addressing one of the Court's earlier questions and didn't  
21 preface that I was actually doing that. So let's take a step  
22 back to slide 16, please.

23 Before the break, we talked about the Gish and ICE-T  
24 references. Those were references that were being asserted in  
25 the re-exam, and so the basis on which those references were

ElfWdroH

Martin - direct

1 distinguished, and we'll look at the alleged disclaimers about  
2 these references in a minute, but I just wanted to point that  
3 out, that those were reexamination references.

4 THE COURT: They were, correct.

5 MR. BUDWIN: The same is true with respect to the  
6 Dickman reference, slide 19, which is where we were at the time  
7 we took the break.

8 THE COURT: Yes, because I think I sent out an e-mail  
9 that said, Guys, where is stuff in the record from the original  
10 prosecution, and I was told that everything was from  
11 reexamination.

12 MR. BUDWIN: Correct, yes. It was a filing of that  
13 nature.

14 Let's pick back up where we were. This is the Dickman  
15 reference, slide 19. It's a re-exam reference, filed in '95.  
16 The date of patent is '99, and talks about URLs and Internet  
17 shortcuts. Could we go to slide three.

18 Q. Would the URLs and the shortcuts in Dickman meet the first  
19 part of the Court's core construction of the interactive link  
20 term?

21 A. Yes, they would, because they can be used to retrieve and  
22 present information stored at remote locations.

23 Q. Would the URLs and the shortcuts in Dickman meet the second  
24 part of the Court's core construction of interactive link?

25 A. No, they wouldn't, because they don't describe the

ElfWdroH

Martin - direct

1 operating state of an application or even an application.

2 MR. BUDWIN: Let's take a look at slide 21. This is a  
3 part of Dickman that we'll actually see being discussed in the  
4 sites that the defendants point to for the alleged disclaimer,  
5 and the very last sentence -- I'll read it, this is describing,  
6 this is quoting, this is actually out of the Dickman patent --  
7 says, "The Internet shortcuts encapsulate URLs or other  
8 location information and other information. The Internet  
9 shortcuts are implemented as objects that are visible within  
10 shell name space."

11 Q. Is that consistent with how you described the Dickman  
12 reference, Mr. Martin?

13 A. Yes, it is.

14 Q. Let's take a look at one more reference that is being  
15 discussed in the prosecution which is LeMole, slide 22. What  
16 do we see as the date of the LeMole patent?

17 A. December 28, 1999.

18 Q. And, again, if we look a little bit below in the abstract,  
19 there is a reference here to specific URL addresses?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. What is the LeMole patent claiming or describing, at a high  
22 level?

23 A. LeMole describes a facility for delivering appropriate  
24 advertisements to Web browser users.

25 Q. And if we look at the next slide, this is the summary of

ElfWdroH

Martin - direct

1 the LeMole invention, straight out of the LeMole patent?

2 THE COURT: Do me a favor. Say that again, what  
3 LeMole was.

4 THE WITNESS: Sure. LeMole describes a technique for  
5 selecting advertisements to display to the user of a Web  
6 browser.

7 BY MR. BUDWIN:

8 Q. In fact, is that what we see being described here with the  
9 summary of the invention, "In accordance with the present  
10 invention, a customized advertising repository server is  
11 connected on the World Wide Web"?

12 A. That's correct.

13 Q. Then if we look a little further, it says, "and it can be  
14 accessed by a registered user through his or her browser,  
15 either by clicking on an icon or inputting a specific URL  
16 address of the particular server which stores the user's  
17 advertising repository."

18 A. Correct.

19 Q. So, if we look back to the Court's core construction of the  
20 interactive link term in slide three -- actually, before we get  
21 there, at a high level, how does the advertising system in  
22 LeMole differ from the inventions claimed in the patent?

23 A. LeMole delivers advertisements, generally images, to a Web  
24 browser user, and it does not discuss applications that do work  
25 on behalf of the user at all.

ElfWdroH

Martin - direct

1 Q. So, again, if we look at the Court's core definition in  
2 slide three, the interactive link term, would the URL that's  
3 being described in LeMole meet the first part of the Court's  
4 construction?

5 A. Yes, it would.

6 Q. Why is that? Why is that?

7 A. Because such URLs were used to retrieve and present  
8 information; namely, advertisements.

9 Q. Would the URLs being discussed in LeMole meet the second  
10 part of the Court's core construction of the interactive link  
11 term?

12 A. No, because the advertising delivered can't be considered  
13 applications.

14 Q. So in light of that background, now that we've talked a  
15 little bit about the technology and the reference, I think it  
16 would be helpful to look at the specific disclaimers that the  
17 defendants are pointing to, and I also think it's important to  
18 keep the disclaimer in mind not only in the context of the  
19 technology as it existed in 1999 in general, but I think it's  
20 fundamentally important to keep in mind the specific technology  
21 and discussion that are in the references that are actually  
22 being distinguished.

23 MR. BUDWIN: Let's take a look at slide 39, please.

24 Q. What we see on slide 39 is one of the disclaimers  
25 defendants have pointed to. Have you reviewed these,

ElfWdroH

Martin - direct

1 Dr. Martin?

2 A. Yes, I have.

3 Q. Here, there is the discussion of Dickman, which is one of  
4 the references we talked about earlier?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. And it says, "Internet shortcuts encapsulate URLs or other  
7 location information and cannot perform the functions of  
8 interactive links as claimed." Do you see that?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. In light of what the Court has already given us, two-part  
11 interactive link construction, what do you understand this  
12 disclaimer to be talking about?

13 A. This disclaimer is talking about the way in which URLs were  
14 used at the time.

15 Q. And specifically in the Dickman reference?

16 A. Specifically in the Dickman reference, and regarding URLs  
17 as communicating location information.

18 Q. And you see, looking at the portions that we've highlighted  
19 here, "The Internet shortcut is used by the operating system to  
20 launch a buffer application and to retrieve resources that  
21 reside in the Internet." URLs and other location information  
22 are merely location data, correct?

23 A. Correct.

24 Q. URLs and other information are elements that inform the  
25 browser to locate certain items, right? That's what the

ElfWdroH

Martin - direct

1 applicants are saying?

2 A. That's correct.

3 Q. And if we go back to the Court's core construction in slide  
4 three, we see that what the applicants are saying is the URLs  
5 that are in Dickman, they talk about location and how to  
6 retrieve information over a network, right?

7 A. They do.

8 Q. That's the first part of the Court's definition?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. I don't see any reference in this disclaimer to the second  
11 part of the Court's core definition, which is about operating  
12 state of applications, so if we go back to slide 39, do you see  
13 any such reference or discussion in the disclaimer?

14 A. No, I don't.

15 Q. Is it fair to say the discussion that's being provided here  
16 is consistent with the Dickman reference and the way that you  
17 described it to the Court?

18 A. Yes, I would say that.

19 Q. Now, the defendants like to focus on the section heading,  
20 "Internet shortcuts do not represent an interactive link."  
21 That's what they point to. But do you think it's important to  
22 actually look into the substance of the argument the applicant  
23 is making in addition to merely looking at section headings?

24 A. Yes, I do. It's important to understand the full  
25 explanation.

ElfWdroH

Martin - direct

1 Q. And this is talking about a specific reference, the Dickman  
2 reference?

3 A. That's my understanding.

4 Q. Now, in addition to what you've told us about the Dickman  
5 reference not including operating statement information, have  
6 you seen any indication from the defendants or from Dr. Shamos  
7 in his declaration that the Dickman reference included  
8 operating state information so that the defendants or the  
9 applicants would have to broaden their disclaimer to get around  
10 it? Have you seen that allegation?

11 A. No, I haven't.

12 Q. Let's take a look at the second disclaimer the defendants  
13 point to, and this is the same basic text of what we saw in the  
14 last one. It's the same heading and it's the same subject  
15 matter. Again, the applicants are pointing out that the  
16 Internet shortcuts in the Dickman reference being discussed  
17 here are location based?

18 THE COURT: You know, I just have to say one thing.  
19 I'm so happy today, this is so much more fun than what I did  
20 the last two days. You guys are such great lawyers, but you're  
21 doing legal argument. I don't need him to be on the stand  
22 while you're doing legal argument. I need him to give  
23 testimony about that which he is an expert. Okay?

24 MR. BUDWIN: That's a fair point.

25 THE COURT: I'm not going to listen to a word he says

ElfWdroH

Martin - direct

1 about legal argument.

2 MR. BUDWIN: That's a fair point. I'll wrap it up.

3 THE COURT: And you're paying for him.

4 MR. BUDWIN: I'll wrap it up briefly.

5 Q. So the discussion here is about location?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. And in your expert opinion and in your review of the  
8 Dickman reference, you would agree the Dickman reference is  
9 talking about location?

10 A. Location represented in the URL, that's right.

11 Q. Not operating state?

12 A. That's right. Not operating state.

13 MR. BUDWIN: Let's take a look at another of the  
14 alleged disclaimers, slide 42.

15 Q. This is the discussion of the LeMole reference, one of the  
16 ones we talked about earlier, advertising, is that right?

17 A. That's correct. LeMole and advertising.

18 Q. And again, it says, "The bookmark is stored on the Web page  
19 location or a URL on a browser, while a browser icon is a  
20 picture that launches a picture application. All browser  
21 elements that inform the browser program to locate certain  
22 elements." Do you see that?

23 A. Yes, I do.

24 Q. Again, they're talking about location?

25 THE COURT: I'm sorry. Icons aren't interactive?

ElfWdroH

Martin - direct

1 When I click on an icon, something doesn't happen? That's  
2 funny. When I click on icons, things happen on my computer.  
3 Is my computer unique?

4 THE WITNESS: No. Icons can be links.

5 THE COURT: They can be links, they can be  
6 interactive, can they not?

7 THE WITNESS: Absolutely, yes.

8 THE COURT: That's what I thought.

9 MR. BUDWIN: But, your Honor, I don't think --

10 THE COURT: No, no. Now you're having a conversation  
11 with me. If you choose to ask him questions, then I get to ask  
12 him follow-up questions. If you want to make legal arguments,  
13 you make them later. Okay?

14 BY MR. BUDWIN:

15 Q. Dr. Martin, do you see the text where it says "special  
16 browser icons are not the same as an interactive link as  
17 claimed"?

18 A. Yes. Right above the highlighted block, it says, "special  
19 browser icons are not the same as an interactive link as  
20 claimed."

21 Q. Do you understand that statement to be saying --

22 THE COURT: No, I don't want to hear what you say it  
23 says. Have you guys ever heard of a leading question, you  
24 people on this side of the room? Are you familiar with that  
25 concept?

ElfWdroH

Martin - direct

1 MR. BUDWIN: Yes, your Honor.

2 THE COURT: Good. Because I've let this go on for  
3 like two hours. I want to hear him. So far, I've heard your  
4 testimony with which he agrees. Okay? I'm not going to give  
5 that a lot of weight, let me tell you that right now. As far  
6 as I'm concerned, he hasn't testified. So if I were you, I'd  
7 quit now and I'd let this man, who has credentials that you and  
8 I do not, testify.

9 MR. BUDWIN: Yes, your Honor. Let me just wrap it up  
10 then.

11 THE COURT: Don't wrap it up with a leading question.  
12 And you, on your feet, as my partner Arthur Liman used to say,  
13 hitting us on the back, "On your feet."

14 MR. SHATZER: Yes, your Honor.

15 THE COURT: Object.

16 You haven't done anything wrong.

17 THE WITNESS: Thank you, your Honor.

18 MR. BUDWIN: Dr. Martin, I appreciate your time and I  
19 think we've hit the issues that we need to hit, your Honor, and  
20 I'll pass the witness for cross-examination.

21 THE COURT: Okay.

22 CROSS-EXAMINATION

23 BY MR. SHATZER:

24 Q. Good morning, Dr. Martin.

25 A. Good morning.

ElfWdroH

Martin - cross

1 Q. We're going to have binders up there for the witness.  
2 We're going to ask you about some documents, I want to make  
3 sure you have them handy.

4 Dr. Martin, I'd like to start by looking at paragraph 28 of  
5 your declaration. Do you see a binder there with your  
6 declaration in it?

7 A. I see it.

8 Q. Could we go to paragraph 28?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. In that paragraph, you discuss something called JavaScript,  
11 correct?

12 A. Yes, I do.

13 Q. What is JavaScript?

14 A. JavaScript is a programming language that is available for  
15 use in a Web browser.

16 Q. And you indicate in paragraph 28 that JavaScript can be  
17 used for special effects and form validation in 1999, correct?

18 A. That's correct.

19 THE COURT: What does that mean?

20 THE WITNESS: So, what I went on to describe in the  
21 declaration was an example of a special effect is, for  
22 instance, when you use your mouse to drive the pointer over an  
23 icon that you can click on but don't click on yet, the icon  
24 might change color, indicating that it's clickable.

25 THE COURT: Okay.

ElfWdroH

Martin - cross

1 BY MR. SHATZER:

2 Q. At the end of paragraph 28, you talk about a JavaScript  
3 application, right?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. What's a JavaScript application?

6 A. A JavaScript application would be an application that  
7 executes task for an end user.

8 Q. I'm sorry. Go ahead.

9 A. And is written in JavaScript.

10 Q. And JavaScript applications are run within a Web browser,  
11 correct?

12 A. That's what I was describing here, yes.

13 Q. And JavaScripts ran within Web browsers in 1999, correct?

14 A. It depends on what you consider an application to be.

15 Q. We don't have to worry about that. The Court's told us  
16 with respect to this patent what an application is, haven't  
17 they? Didn't the Court, in its claim construction order, give  
18 us a definition? Are you familiar with that?

19 A. Yes, I am.

20 Q. And the definition is a software program that executes  
21 specific tasks for an end user, correct?

22 A. That's correct.

23 Q. So a JavaScript application meets that definition, does it  
24 not?

25 A. Yes.

ElfWdroH

Martin - cross

1 Q. And JavaScript applications ran on browsers in 1999,  
2 correct?

3 A. I think such applications did exist, yes.

4 Q. You talked a little bit in your direct about what you  
5 called old Yahoo!, and we had a little video. Do you know what  
6 I'm talking about when I say old Yahoo!? Can I use that  
7 shorthand?

8 A. Sure.

9 Q. I believe you said, please correct me if I am wrong about  
10 this, but I believe you said old Yahoo! was not an application,  
11 is that right?

12 A. I don't recall if I used that exact phrasing.

13 THE COURT: I don't recall that you did either.

14 MR. SHATZER: Let me ask then.

15 Q. Was old Yahoo! an application?

16 A. I can see how it would be considered a server side  
17 application, but not a client side application or a mixed  
18 client/server application.

19 THE COURT: You mean it was an application under my  
20 definition, but it's an application that ran on the server and  
21 not on the client side?

22 THE WITNESS: That's exactly it, yes.

23 THE COURT: Okay. So it's an application, but it's  
24 over there, not over here.

25 THE WITNESS: That's right.

ElfWdroH

Martin - cross

1                   THE COURT: Okay.

2 BY MR. SHATZER:

3 Q. Would a browser in 1999 meet the Court's definition of an  
4 application?

5 A. Yes. I would say that a browser in isolation could, yes,  
6 would meet the Court's definition of application, in 1999.

7 Q. During your testimony today, you used the word  
8 "application" quite a bit. You talked about things that were  
9 applications, things that weren't applications. When you were  
10 giving that testimony, were you applying the Court's definition  
11 of application in each instance?

12 A. I believe I was, yes.

13 Q. You talked about Web sites and what they could do in 1999.  
14 Isn't it true that not all Web sites in 1999 required complete  
15 page refresh before providing new information?

16 A. That's true. Some other information could be shown without  
17 a complete page refresh, such as scrolling the page up and  
18 down, for instance.

19                   THE COURT: You mean it wouldn't all appear on the  
20 screen, but I could make more of it appear on the screen by  
21 scrolling up and down?

22                   THE WITNESS: Exactly.

23                   THE COURT: Okay.

24 BY MR. SHATZER:

25 Q. Let's turn to paragraph ten of your declaration. The first

ElfWdroH

Martin - cross

1 sentence reads: "In the years following 1999, Web browsers and  
2 available computers became more powerful and their ability to  
3 run applications within the Web browser became more practical."

4 But as we discussed before, it's true that even in 1999,  
5 computers could run applications within the Web browser,  
6 correct?

7 A. Correct.

8 Q. In fact, we just talked about JavaScript as an example of  
9 that, correct?

10 A. A JavaScript application could be run in 1999, yes.

11 Q. The next sentence, paragraph ten, you refer to these new  
12 applications, and I'm going to talk about them. You're talking  
13 about these new applications; you're not talking about  
14 JavaScript applications, right?

15 A. No. I am talking about these new applications that were  
16 now more practical because of the improving technology.

17 Q. So you could do different things with JavaScript  
18 applications, but they already existed, right?

19 A. As I said, yes, JavaScript applications existed in 1999.

20 Q. I'd like to talk now about what you referred to, I think,  
21 as new Yahoo!. If I use that term, do you know what I'm  
22 talking about, your second video?

23 A. I do, or modern Yahoo!, yes.

24 Q. Modern Yahoo!. Obviously it was your video, so if you need  
25 your counsel to call it up for you, I have some questions for

ElfWdroH

Martin - cross

1 you. Perhaps there's something in your declaration you could  
2 point me to, but my question is in the new Yahoo!, where is the  
3 interactive link, in the modern Yahoo!?

4 A. Well, I did not set out to identify the interactive link  
5 when I created that video, but in response to your question, I  
6 would tentatively point to the URL, including the fragment  
7 identifier that was shown in that video, as a candidate for the  
8 interactive link.

9 Q. How does that URL with the fragment identifier facilitate  
10 operating state?

11 A. If the operating state in question is the range of dates  
12 over which the index graph is to be generated, then that  
13 operating state information is encoded or appears to be encoded  
14 in the fragment identifier portion of the URL.

15 Q. Just so I'm clear, when you use the term "operating state,"  
16 what do you understand that to be?

17 A. As I described earlier, operating state determines what an  
18 application is doing at a particular moment, as opposed to all  
19 the things the application is possible of doing.

20 THE COURT: Okay.

21 THE WITNESS: Capable of doing.

22 THE COURT: Got it.

23 I may be oversimplifying. As you testified on direct,  
24 and it did clear up some things. I now understand your  
25 affidavit much better. Thank you. I got the impression that

ElfWdroH

Martin - cross

1 by operating state, you were using that term synonymously with  
2 a previous screen, going back to a screen that you had been on  
3 before, and that's what you meant by restoring the operating  
4 state. Is that what you meant by restoring operating state,  
5 going back to a screen that had already appeared and that I'd  
6 navigated away from?

7 THE WITNESS: That could be one way to look at it.  
8 Yeah, that would count as restoring operating state. If, by  
9 restoring that screen, you've taken the application back to a  
10 state that you've desired to put it in, yeah.

11 THE COURT: Let me be crude about this. I'm checking  
12 my Gmail. I navigate away from that to, because something  
13 appears on the side about a weight loss product, an issue in  
14 which I take great interest, and I click on that, and I read  
15 about the weight loss product, and I want to go back to my  
16 Gmail, and I click back on Gmail and, lo and behold, I'm back  
17 with my e-mail. Have I restored an operating state, as you're  
18 defining that term?

19 THE WITNESS: Potentially, yes. And I can add a  
20 little more detail to make this, I think, easier to understand.

21 THE COURT: Thank you.

22 THE WITNESS: When you're looking at your Gmail  
23 folder, you have different folders, your inbox and your junk  
24 mail and maybe your other folders. So what I would point to as  
25 operating state in that case is which folder you're currently

ElfWdroH

Martin - cross

1 looking at within the Gmail application.

2 THE COURT: If I go from inbox to trash to try to find  
3 something that I've thrown in the trash but that's alluded to  
4 in an e-mail. I'm navigating away from operating state A,  
5 going into operating state B, and if I go back to my inbox,  
6 I've restored the operating state?

7 THE WITNESS: That's correct.

8 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

9 THE WITNESS: You're welcome.

10 THE COURT: That's very helpful.

11 BY MR. SHATZER:

12 Q. How does modern Yahoo!'s URL allow restoring an operating  
13 state, but the old Yahoo! does not? Is it just because one's  
14 an application and the other's not?

15 A. It's because whether the application is running on the  
16 client or not that provides the Yahoo! example. That's the  
17 difference.

18 THE COURT: So the real difference here, and this, I  
19 think, I asked you about when you were on direct, the real  
20 difference here is where the application is. In 1999, it  
21 wouldn't run on my computer; it would only run on the Yahoo!  
22 server. But now there's a way to get an application to run on  
23 this machine?

24 THE WITNESS: That's correct, yes.

25 THE COURT: And the Web browser I'm using. I'm using

ElfWdroH

Martin - cross

1 AOL as my Web browser. Yahoo! doesn't like that, but Yahoo!  
2 doesn't care because it can send an application, and I can run  
3 the application on this.

4 THE WITNESS: Yes.

5 BY MR. SHATZER:

6 Q. Just to follow up on the judge's questions, some  
7 applications could be run -- so it's true though, following up  
8 on the judge's question, that some applications could run in  
9 the Web browser, even in 1999, like a JavaScript application,  
10 right?

11 A. JavaScript applications could run in a Web browser in 1999,  
12 for instance, a calculator application.

13 Q. And a person of ordinary skill in the art would have known  
14 that in 1999?

15 THE COURT: What he said was a person of ordinary  
16 skill would have known that.

17 There's no way she could have taken that down. It  
18 came out as blah, blah, blah.

19 MR. SHATZER: It's one of our terms of art.

20 THE COURT: It's a term of art for you. Every day,  
21 she has new terms of art.

22 Q. Dr. Martin, are you familiar with the term "session  
23 identifier"?

24 A. Yes, sir, I am.

25 Q. What's a session identifier?

ElfWdroH

Martin - cross

1 A. A session identifier generally is a number or some other  
2 string that is used to look up data in a database about a  
3 particular session.

4 Q. And you would agree that prior to 1999, URLs could store  
5 session data using session identifiers?

6 A. Generally speaking, yes. Session identifiers could be used  
7 for shopping cart memory, for instance.

8 Q. And are you familiar, let's look at, actually, the errata  
9 that Dr. Shamos filed to his declaration yesterday that refers  
10 to the CDNow site. Are you familiar with that?

11 THE COURT: A site I never heard of.

12 BY MR. SHATZER:

13 Q. It should be in the very back of the larger binder you  
14 have, the second-to-the-last tab.

15 A. I see it, yes.

16 Q. Do you see on the page where his signature is there's a  
17 screen shot? Do you see that?

18 A. Yes, I do.

19 Q. And do you see that the text mode button on the bottom  
20 right-hand corner of the page, there's a cursor over query?

21 A. I see it.

22 Q. Do you see that the URL for the hyperlink there contains an  
23 SID number?

24 A. I see that, yes.

25 Q. And that's a session identifier, correct?

ElfWdroH

Martin - cross

1 A. It could be a session identifier.

2 Q. Do you see that it contains the characters DM equals T?

3 A. I see the URL contains those characters.

4 Q. And if I represented to you that this display mode equals  
5 text, do you have any reason to disagree with that?

6 A. Well, I guess I don't know what it stands for, but I'm  
7 willing to let you represent that. Sure.

8 THE COURT: If he doesn't know what it stands for, I'm  
9 sure Dr. Shamos is going to have something to say about it.

10 BY MR. SHATZER:

11 Q. Do you understand, in December of 1996, that the CDNow  
12 site, if I went on there and let's say I were going to search  
13 for Beatles albums, would give my session a session identifier  
14 so if I bookmarked that and I clicked on it, it would take me  
15 back to the main CDNow page, it would take me back to my search  
16 results for Beatles albums?

17 THE COURT: Do you have any familiarity with this  
18 particular site?

19 THE WITNESS: Yes, I do. And I guess I don't remember  
20 specifically what the 1997 Web site did, but that sounds  
21 possible to me.

22 BY MR. SHATZER:

23 Q. Let me frame it another way. Pre-1999, a Web site could  
24 use session identifiers in a way, and URLs, where, if I  
25 bookmarked them, I could go back to a page I had visited

ElfWdroH

Martin - cross

1 before, like search results?

2 A. Yes. Whatever could be put in a bookmark, in a URL before  
3 1999 could be stored in a bookmark, including a URL that  
4 contained an SID number.

5 THE COURT: Anything that could be put in a URL in  
6 1999 could get bookmarked, is that what you said?

7 THE WITNESS: Yes.

8 BY MR. SHATZER:

9 Q. Would you consider that session identifier taking me back  
10 to my search results to be restoring operating state, previous  
11 operating state?

12 A. Possibly, yes. It could be considered to restore a  
13 previous operating state of the server side shopping cart  
14 facility.

15 Q. Let's go to paragraph 19 of your declaration.

16 A. Paragraph 19, I have it.

17 Q. 19 and 20 are excerpts from what appear to be what I would  
18 characterize as a chat discussion from the Internet, is that  
19 fair?

20 A. I wouldn't call it a chat discussion, no.

21 Q. What would you call it?

22 A. I would call it a technical article post, possibly a blog  
23 post, with comments.

24 Q. The author of the blog post is Mike Stenhouse, is that  
25 right?

ElfWdroH

Martin - cross

1 A. That's right.

2 Q. Do you know Mike Stenhouse?

3 A. Not personally, no.

4 Q. Do you know if he was a person of ordinary skill in the art  
5 in 1999, in the art we're talking about?

6 A. I hadn't thought of that before. I suspect that he is, but  
7 I'm not sure one way or another, as I sit here.

8 Q. You cannot tell me anything, can you, sir, about  
9 Mr. Stenhouse's qualifications as a person of ordinary skill in  
10 the art, correct?

11 A. On the contrary. I can.

12 Q. Mr. Stenhouse, in paragraph 19, in this post, is talking  
13 about discovering a solution to restoring a session state, is  
14 that right?

15 A. Generally speaking, yes. He describes it, I believe, as  
16 browser state.

17 THE COURT: That says I'm trying to restore the  
18 session state.

19 THE WITNESS: Yes.

20 THE COURT: Part of my problem was with paragraphs 19  
21 and 20. I didn't really understand. There was some different  
22 terminology used.

23 THE WITNESS: You're right. I was looking at the  
24 following page. Sessions there, yes.

25 BY MR. SHATZER:

ElfWdroH

Martin - cross

1 Q. And this blog post and discussion is dated 2005, correct?

2 A. That's correct.

3 Q. You don't know whether or not Mr. Stenhouse discovered this  
4 solution in 2005 though, do you?

5 A. I'm not sure exactly when he discovered the solution. I  
6 understood it to be in proximity to his writing this article  
7 about it.

8 Q. Let's go to paragraph 20. You say, "The comments below  
9 Mr. Stenhouse's explanation indicate that other Web developers  
10 were generally unaware of this technique and that this use of  
11 URLs and bookmarks was not generally known." By "this use of  
12 URLs and bookmarks," what are you referring to specifically?

13 A. I'm referring to the use of the fragment identifier field  
14 in the URL in order to store operating state of a JavaScript  
15 application.

16 Q. And then you quote these comments. Who is Ignacio?

17 A. Ignacio is one of the commenters.

18 Q. And was Ignacio a person of ordinary skill in the pertinent  
19 art of the '745 patent as of 1999?

20 A. It appears that Ignacio was capable of understanding the  
21 technical explanation on this page. Whether that makes him a  
22 person of ordinary skill in the art, I would lean towards that  
23 direction, but I wouldn't definitively say that he is given to  
24 own this.

25 Q. Isn't it true that all this tells us is that somebody we

ElfWdroH

Martin - cross

1 don't know named Ignacio, in 2005, learned about this solution  
2 for the first time? It doesn't tell us what anyone of the  
3 ordinary skill in the art knew about the solution in 1999, does  
4 it?

5 A. I think it does contribute to that understanding because  
6 what we have is a reader of this highly technical discussion  
7 who seems to appreciate it.

8 Q. We don't know anything about this person other than his  
9 first name, isn't that true?

10 A. Or possibly last name. I don't know.

11 Q. And then the comment on page nine, bridging over to page  
12 ten, is from someone named Jim. Was Jim a person of ordinary  
13 skill in the pertinent art of the '745 patent as of 1999?

14 A. Again, I would lean in that direction, but not knowing Jim,  
15 I'd hesitate to say definitively.

16 Q. So this 2005 online exchange between semi-anonymous  
17 commentators doesn't really tell us anything about the  
18 question --

19 THE COURT: That's a perfect example of an  
20 argumentative question.

21 MR. SHATZER: All right, your Honor. I'll withdraw  
22 it.

23 THE COURT: Thank you.

24 MR. SHATZER: You're welcome.

25 Your Honor, may I have a moment to confer with my

ElfWdroH

Martin - cross

1       colleagues.

2                  THE COURT: Sure.

3 BY MR. SHATZER:

4 Q. One last question. When you were comparing modern Yahoo!  
5 with old Yahoo!, and you concluded that one was and one was not  
6 an application that restored operating state, did you look at  
7 the JavaScript code of the two to compare them?

8 A. No. I used an alternate technique.

9 Q. What was that?

10 A. In the old example, I disabled JavaScript altogether and  
11 generated the graph that showed that the JavaScript application  
12 did not exist or was not instrumentally involved in causing the  
13 graph to appear in the old example.

14                  MR. SHATZER: I have nothing further. Thank you.

15                  THE WITNESS: You're welcome.

16 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

17 BY MR. BUDWIN:

18 Q. Just a few brief questions for you, Dr. Martin. We had a  
19 couple of questions about JavaScript applications in 1999 and  
20 you gave the example of a calculator, do you recall that?

21 A. Yes, I do.

22 Q. You got claim language shared from the patent, would that  
23 example meet the claim language that's being shown?

24                  THE COURT: You mean does a calculator fall within the  
25 claim language?

ElfWdroH

Martin - redirect

1                   MR. BUDWIN: Your Honor, the purpose of my question is  
2 I want to understand whether or not this calculator that  
3 Dr. Martin was describing was or wasn't a distributed  
4 application. In this instance, what you're going to see is --

5                   THE COURT: What I'm going to see is whatever he tells  
6 me the answer is. I'd like to hear it from him before I hear  
7 it from you.

8 BY MR. BUDWIN:

9 Q. Dr. Martin, do you recall being asked about JavaScript  
10 applications in 1999?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. And in particular, the calculator?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Is the calculator a JavaScript application or similar  
15 applications that existed in 1999 relevant to the claims at  
16 issue in this case?

17 A. The problem with those applications and applying them to  
18 the claims is that -- well, there are many steps to the claims,  
19 and I don't see the back and forth of information flow that  
20 needs to happen to satisfy the claim as a whole.

21 Q. Then I have one other area of inquiry for you.

22                   THE COURT: You mean the back and forth of information  
23 from the server to this machine connected to my Web browser?

24                   THE WITNESS: Yes, but more than that. In claim one,  
25 for example, there is first information, second information,

ElfWdroH

Martin - redirect

1 third information. It's not just a simple, single back and  
2 forth. There have to be multiple exchanges of data that are  
3 recited in the claim.

4 BY MR. BUDWIN:

5 Q. Dr. Martin, you were asked some questions about session  
6 identifiers. Do you recall that?

7 A. Yes, I do.

8 Q. What's the purpose of a session identifier?

9 A. The session identifier, as we were discussing earlier, is  
10 used in order to remind a server side application of where it  
11 was the last time this Web browser user did something with the  
12 server, clicked on a link, or something like that.

13 Q. Is the fact that session identifiers existed and were used  
14 by a server relevant to the question that you're endeavoring to  
15 answer today?

16 THE COURT: Which is the definition of interactive  
17 link, in case you've forgotten the question that he asked that  
18 we have on the table today.

19 A. It's relevant, but it describes the strictly server side  
20 part of the equation, as I understand it.

21 Q. Counsel asked you some questions about a CDNow Web site  
22 from '96 and '97. Do you recall that?

23 A. Yes, I do.

24 Q. Is that discussed in the prosecution history?

25 A. That example is not discussed, no.

ElfWdroH

Martin - redirect

1 Q. Do you recall any arguments or disclaimers made by the  
2 applicants about the CDNow Web page in 1996 or '97?

3 A. No, I don't.

4 Q. And even though you just got the updated declaration from  
5 Dr. Shamos yesterday, have you reviewed that?

6 A. Yes, I have.

7 Q. And how would you describe CDNow in 1996 or 1997? How did  
8 it work? How did it work?

9 A. So, the way CDNow worked was, as I described before, the  
10 Web browser was used as essentially a viewing portal into the  
11 Web server presentation of the CDNow Web site. So, yes, users  
12 could browse music and buy albums. The session identifier was  
13 most likely used in order to keep track of what is in a user's  
14 shopping cart, for instance.

15 Q. Is that similar to the old Yahoo! example that we talked  
16 about earlier?

17 A. Yeah, I find it similar in the sense that the information  
18 in the session ID is really only of concern to the Web server  
19 and not a client side application.

20 MR. BUDWIN: Thank you, Dr. Martin.

21 THE COURT: Anybody else have anything for Dr. Martin?

22 MR. SHATZER: Nothing.

23 MR. BUDWIN: No, your Honor.

24 MR. SHATZER: Nothing further, your Honor.

25 THE COURT: Thank you.

ElfWdroH

Martin - redirect

1                   THE WITNESS: You're welcome.

2                   (Witness excused)

3                   THE COURT: It's 25 of one. I realize I interrupted  
4 you all for half an hour, but I don't know if it makes sense to  
5 start with Mr. Shamos or take an early hour for lunch and come  
6 back in an hour.

7                   MR. SHATZER: I think we'd prefer to break now, your  
8 Honor, if we could.

9                   THE COURT: I'll see you at quarter of two and I'll be  
10 ready to go. Okay?

11                  (Luncheon recess)

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ElfWdroH

Martin - redirect

## 1 AFTERNOON SESSION

2

3 THE COURT: Here we are again. Have a seat. Am I  
4 going to hear from Dr. Shamos now?

5 MR. SHATZER: Your Honor, defendants call Dr. Shamos.

6 MICHAEL IAN SHAMOS,

7 called as a witness by the Defendants,

8 having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

## 9 DIRECT EXAMINATION

10 BY MR. SHATZER:

11 Q. Could you please state your name.

12 THE COURT: He already did that.

13 BY MR. SHATZER:

14 Q. Dr. Shamos, could you very briefly tell us about your  
15 relevant background and expertise?16 A. Yes. I've been involved with computers and computer  
17 programming for a little bit over 50 years. To condense a long  
18 story, making it very short, I think the relevant experience is  
19 that since 1998, I have been director or codirector of the  
20 graduate programs at Carnegie Mellon University in electronic  
21 commerce and e-business, all of which is very heavily Web  
22 oriented.23 Q. Dr. Shamos, if you could, turn in your binder, I think it's  
24 the very last thing in the big binder, to the Court's claim  
25 construction decision.

ElfWdroH

Shamos - direct

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. And if you could, go to page 11, please.

3 A. I'm there.

4 Q. At the bottom, that's where the Court gave its core  
5 definition of interactive link, which is "computer code that,  
6 one, retrieves and presents applications and/or information,  
7 stored at remote locations across the network when selected by  
8 an end user; and, two, includes facilities for restoring  
9 previous operating states of the application as the application  
10 is re-presented at a user's computer." Do you see that?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. If you could look at page 13, about the middle of the page,  
13 is it your understanding the question before the Court today is  
14 whether or not the Court should add to that construction the  
15 following: "an interactive link cannot be a bookmark, cookie,  
16 shortcut, hyperlink, or Internet address (URL)"?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. Has the meaning of the terms "bookmark," "cookie,"  
19 "shortcut," "hyperlink," or "URL" changed to one of ordinary  
20 skill in the art since 1999?

21 A. No.

22 Q. Keeping in mind the Court's construction of interactive  
23 link, would one of ordinary skill in the art understand the  
24 capabilities of bookmarks, cookies, shortcut, hyperlinks, or  
25 URLs to have materially changed since 1999?

ElfWdroH

Shamos - direct

1 A. No.

2 Q. Can you explain why that's the case?

3 A. Yes. So many of these things are the subject of Internet  
4 standards. And those standards have been incorporated into  
5 numerous pieces of software, including server software and  
6 browser software. And so it is not a trivial matter to change  
7 the way these things behave because it would cause a huge  
8 amount of critical Internet software to be obsoleted. That  
9 said, people can dream up new uses for these things, but that  
10 doesn't change what those things are.

11 Q. In his opening, Mr. Reichman said that distributed  
12 applications could not run on Web browsers in 1999. Is that  
13 your understanding?

14 A. No, it's not, and maybe I ought to explain my understanding  
15 of distributed application first. In a distributed  
16 application, there's code that runs on at least two different  
17 computers, and some of the processing is done on one computer  
18 and some of the processing is done on another computer. In a  
19 client/server environment, distributed application would mean  
20 that the server is doing some of the work and the client is  
21 doing some of the work. And as long as there is code, for  
22 example, running on the browser, that is executing based on  
23 information that's being received from the server, then some of  
24 the processing is done on the server and some is done on the  
25 client. And this is only with respect to Web browsers. I

ElfWdroH

Shamos - direct

1 mean, there were plenty of distributed applications not  
2 involving browsers that ran over the Internet in 1999.

3 Q. Can you give some examples of Web browsers in 1999 that ran  
4 distributed applications?

5 A. Yeah. I'm thinking that you probably didn't mean Web  
6 browsers; you mean can I give you examples of applications that  
7 were distributed that happen to run in a Web browser.

8 Q. Yes, when you put it that way.

9 A. Yes, there were many. So I used to teach, when I was  
10 teaching a foundational course in electronic commerce. It was  
11 called E-commerce Technologies, and I had lectures on various  
12 technologies that one might bring to bear on, for e-commerce  
13 Web sites, in order to sell things over the Internet. And one  
14 of my favorite examples was one from a clothing retailer that  
15 allowed you to shape in general a model of yourself on your own  
16 browser. So it wouldn't capture your face, but it would  
17 capture your overall proportions, and then when you picked an  
18 article of clothing, it would choose the right size and it  
19 would show you what that clothing would look like on a model  
20 having your proportions.

21 Now, some of that processing is being done on the server  
22 and some of the processing was being done on the client. So  
23 there's a perfect example of a distributed application.

24 Q. Would JavaScript be another example of a distributed  
25 application that would run on a Web browser in 1999?

ElfWdroH

Shamos - direct

1 A. In general. I think there were some dumbed-down ways of  
2 using JavaScript which might not actually qualify as a  
3 distributed application. For example, if everything that  
4 JavaScript is doing is purely local to the browser and is not  
5 communicating with the server, I'm not sure you'd call that a  
6 distributed application. For example, if all you're doing is  
7 mouse-overs, which the server never learns about, and all  
8 you're doing is seeing that on your browser screen, but if the  
9 server has relegated to the browser the responsibility for  
10 doing substantive processing of the data, then it would be a  
11 distributed application.

12 Q. And in 1999, JavaScript could do that?

13 A. Oh, yes, indeed. Not only could, it did, because there  
14 were numerous Web sites that used that capability.

15 Q. To put it another way, is it true that in 1999, all a  
16 browser could do was display a page?

17 A. Not at all.

18 Q. There was some testimony from Dr. Martin he had attached to  
19 his declaration, an Ajax book. Is all the information from the  
20 Ajax book that Dr. Martin cited in his direct testimony today  
21 accurate, in your view?

22 A. No, and I sort of thought that we were being asked to  
23 simply accept at face value what was going on in that book, and  
24 I think the book makes a number of very sweeping statements  
25 that, just by virtue of their sweepiness, are incorrect.

ElfWdroH

Shamos - direct

1 They talk about all Web sites did this and no Web site did  
2 that, etc., without any evidence or any credible argument that  
3 the author of the book was able to examine all Web sites. So  
4 there were lots of statements of that kind that I simply don't  
5 think should be accepted.

6 Q. There was some testimony earlier about MapQuest when  
7 Dr. Martin testified. Do you recall that?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. What, in your view, is the relevance of the fact -- let me  
10 withdraw that.

11 What is the relevance to the question before the Court  
12 today of the fact that MapQuest could be presented more  
13 efficiently in 2005 than in 1999?

14 A. I don't see any.

15 Q. Why not?

16 A. Because it doesn't relate to any new use of any of the  
17 constructs that are, that defendants seek to have added to the  
18 disclaimer.

19 THE COURT: I'm not sure I understand that answer.

20 THE WITNESS: Okay. So there's a list of constructs.  
21 URLs, bookmarks, cookies and shortcut, etc. And there is no  
22 difference in any of those in the old MapQuest versus the new  
23 MapQuest. All the constructs are exactly the same and they're  
24 used for the same purpose. The shortcut is to get you back to  
25 a particular page you were looking at. A URL is to both

ElfWdroH

Shamos - direct

1 request information from a server and also, for example, in a  
2 query string, pass information from a client to a server. None  
3 of those has changed going from the old MapQuest to new  
4 MapQuest.

5 Q. To the extent it operates more efficiently, it doesn't have  
6 anything to do with the URLs or the shortcuts or bookmarks?

7 A. I don't think so. No one is suggesting that the Web hasn't  
8 improved and that computers haven't gotten faster and that we  
9 don't have a lot more memory cheaply available now than we used  
10 to. So that's given rise to people believing things are now  
11 feasible simply because of the processing power that might not  
12 have been feasible in older days when things were smaller. But  
13 that has not changed the nature of or the usage of these  
14 constructs that we're talking about.

15 Q. Is a browser an application under this Court's definition  
16 of that term?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. When a bookmark is selected on a browser, is any state of  
19 the browser restored?

20 A. So --

21 THE COURT: Read the question again.

22 BY MR. SHATZER:

23 Q. When a bookmark is selected on a browser, is any state of  
24 the browser restored?

25 A. So, state is an elusive concept. State refers to something

ElfWdroH

Shamos - direct

1 historical. If the aspect of history you're concerned about is  
2 what page was being viewed, then when you save a bookmark that  
3 marks that page and you later select that bookmark, you are  
4 again looking at the page that you were previously viewing. So  
5 there's some portion of state that is being saved and being  
6 restored.

7 Q. Was that true in 1999?

8 A. Oh, yes.

9 Q. Let's talk a little bit about modern Yahoo! and old Yahoo!.  
10 In the modern Yahoo! -- well, let me just be clear. When I say  
11 modern Yahoo!, would you understand what I'm referring to from  
12 Dr. Martin's testimony?

13 A. Yes, I think we're talking about the finance part of the  
14 Yahoo! site that displays stock charts.

15 Q. Correct.

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. In the modern Yahoo! application, does the fragment  
18 identifier that Dr. Martin identified store operating state?

19 A. I don't think anybody's pointed to a fragment identifier  
20 that stores operating state anywhere in any of the examples  
21 that were given.

22 Q. Based on your understanding of how the modern Yahoo!  
23 application works, could it have been implemented in 1999?

24 A. Yes. Similar functionality could have been implemented.  
25 It might not have been implemented in exactly the same way.

ElfWdroH

Shamos - direct

1 Q. Let's talk about old Yahoo! now. Did old Yahoo! allow  
2 saving a date range for a stock chart?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. Could a bookmark in 1999 show a page in a browser that had  
5 previously been displayed?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. In his direct testimony, Dr. Martin tried to draw the  
8 distinction that he, let me say, tried to draw a distinction  
9 between old Yahoo! and modern Yahoo!. Do you believe that  
10 extensions that he was drawing are relevant to the question of  
11 the meaning of interactive link to a person of ordinary skill  
12 in 1999?

13 A. No.

14 Q. Why not?

15 A. The only difference between old Yahoo! and new Yahoo!, and  
16 I want to make the point that both made extensive use of  
17 JavaScript and, in fact, the amount of JavaScript in the old  
18 and the new is just about the same in terms of number of bytes  
19 of JavaScript, the -- in the interim, a more efficient way was  
20 found of allowing one to navigate around the stock chart  
21 without having to send, essentially to reload the page or to  
22 send additional chart information. But from the point of view  
23 of the processing that was going on in the browser with respect  
24 to old Yahoo! and new Yahoo! and the saving of state, I don't  
25 see substantive differences.

ElfWdroH

Shamos - direct

1 Q. Dr. Martin referred to the relevance of restoring operating  
2 state. Do you recall him showing any examples of restoring an  
3 operating state?

4 A. Well, so, there were certainly examples of restoring the  
5 state. A state is an overall generic term of which operating  
6 state is obviously a subset. Now, there hasn't been a  
7 construction yet of operating state, and so I believe what was  
8 shown is certainly saving pieces, components of operating  
9 state, possibly not saving the entire operating state.

10 Q. Did Web pages in 1999 have embedded code that would be  
11 executed by a browser?

12 A. Yes. JavaScript is an example of that.

13 Q. There was some testimony earlier about the Gish patent.  
14 Are you familiar with that patent?

15 A. Only a little bit.

16 Q. But does the client application running in the Gish patent  
17 have an operating state?

18 A. Yes. All applications have operating states.

19 Q. Could a URL or bookmark in 1999 be used in restoring  
20 operating state?

21 A. This is a complicated question. And it depends on exactly  
22 what's meant by operating state and whether operating state  
23 means saving every conceivable relevant portion of the state.  
24 Certainly portions of operating state would be easily restored,  
25 easily stored, and would be restorable. Let me give an example

ElfWdroH

Shamos - direct

1 of that.

2 When I interact with, there are numerous Web sites that are  
3 oriented toward international use so that people who speak  
4 different languages can effectively still interact with the  
5 site, and once you tell the site what language you would like  
6 to talk to the site in, every time you visit that site again,  
7 you will be presented with pages in your own language. So to a  
8 certain extent, just the knowledge of what language you want to  
9 interact with the site in is a form of state. That doesn't  
10 mean that you can go back to exactly the same page and view it  
11 in exactly the same way, or that if there were JavaScript  
12 running in your browser, that all the variables in the  
13 JavaScript would have exactly the same values when you came  
14 back. So language is just a piece of state.

15 If you take the totality of all pieces of state that enable  
16 you to go back and have what's running in the browser exactly  
17 the same as what was running when you left off, then you've  
18 reached, you've stored the entire operating state. Anything  
19 less than that isn't the entire operating state. It's pieces  
20 of it.

21 Q. As an expert and based on your review of Dr. Martin's  
22 declaration and his testimony here today, what is your opinion  
23 of the overall significance of Dr. Martin's testimony on the  
24 issue of meaning of the term "interactive link" to a person of  
25 ordinary skill in the art in 1999?

ElfWdroH

Shamos - direct

1 A. I don't think there is any. And the reason for that is  
2 that we're talking about the meaning and capabilities of these  
3 what I refer to as the constructs, which are the ones in the  
4 putative disclaimer. Those haven't changed. So, I don't think  
5 the plaintiff is happy with that, and so they have to show that  
6 something, somewhere has changed in the interim. And there  
7 have been changes. I mean, there are new technologies. There  
8 are new uses that have been made of URLs in the meantime, but  
9 that just doesn't change the fundamental nature of what  
10 interactive link is.

11 MR. SHATZER: No further questions. I pass the  
12 witness.

13 THE COURT: Can you talk to me a little bit -- this  
14 was in your affidavit as well -- about these standards that you  
15 say these constructs, or at least some of them, are subject to  
16 certain standards, some body promulgates standards that would  
17 make it difficult to change what it is that they mean or what  
18 it is that they do? I'd like to hear more about that.

19 THE WITNESS: Certainly. So I think a very good  
20 example is URL because URL is so universal. All browsers have  
21 to understand URLs. Web servers have to understand URLs  
22 because they're going to be getting them hundreds of thousands  
23 or millions of times a second. We already know from, I think,  
24 both of our declarations that there's something in URL called a  
25 query string, and it begins with a question mark character.

ElfWdroH

Shamos - direct

1 And what follows the question mark character is the query  
2 string that is passed in a uniform way to the Web server.

3 Now let's suppose I would like to change the format of  
4 URLs and I'd like to add a new, special character with a  
5 special substring in there, so I decide I want to add an  
6 exclamation point as a delimiter that would indicate a  
7 particular part of a URL. Well, I could do that and I could  
8 implement it on my Web server and I could write a browser that  
9 understood that exclamation point character, so my browser and  
10 my Web server could talk to one another, but your Internet  
11 Explorer browser or your Chrome browser would have no idea what  
12 that exclamation point meant, and no other Web server in the  
13 world would understand that. So I can't as a practical matter  
14 do that the way I want to.

15 If I wanted to add, for example, such an exclamation  
16 point character, I would create a request for comment. The  
17 request for comment would be distributed to the Internet gurus  
18 and then maybe after a time the World Wide Web consortium would  
19 adopt that as a standard for URLs. Then I could actually  
20 change what a URL was. But, in general, it's extremely  
21 difficult to do that because it requires everybody who has a  
22 browser or a server around the world to go and change their  
23 code. That's what I mean by a standard and the difficulty of  
24 changing a literal worldwide standard. I mean, it's used  
25 everywhere.

ElfWdroH

Shamos - direct

1                   THE COURT: Okay. Understood. URLs. It's the World  
2 Wide Web consortium that sets these standards?

3                   THE WITNESS: Sort of. Unfortunately, the  
4 organization of the Internet is unlike any other.

5                   THE COURT: A lot of cowboys out there, I understand.

6                   THE WITNESS: So what happens is that standards  
7 basically develop by acclamation. That is, somebody publishes  
8 a request for comment, and people comment on it and they say,  
9 well, this is a terrible idea for the following reasons, and if  
10 the naysayer carries the day, then the request for comment  
11 never gets adopted by everybody. But after a period of time,  
12 if there's endorsement of the idea, then eventually, the people  
13 who produce Web browsers, Web servers, and other Internet  
14 software will essentially adopt the recommendations in the RFC.  
15 And there have been many thousands of RFCs. Some of them have  
16 gone nowhere and some of them are critically important.

17                  THE COURT: Kind of like Wikipedia.

18                  THE WITNESS: In a certain sense, I understand that,  
19 because anybody can generate an RFC, if you'd like to, and  
20 anybody could make a Wikipedia entry, if they would like to.

21                  THE COURT: In reading your affidavit, it looked to me  
22 like, at least with respect to URLs and one other, one of the  
23 other terms --

24                  THE WITNESS: There are bookmarks --

25                  THE COURT: It looked to me like you were saying that

ElfWdroH

Shamos - direct

1 there was some standard, let me see if I can find this.

2 THE WITNESS: Well, hyperlink is the same.

3 THE COURT: Hyperlink. That was it.

4 THE WITNESS: Yes. Essentially, a hyperlink is an  
5 embedded URL.

6 THE COURT: "In 1994, the network working group of the  
7 Internet engineering task force adopted certain standards for  
8 the URL." That's paragraph 36 of your affidavit. What's the  
9 network working group of Internet engineering task force?

10 THE WITNESS: Well, as I said, there's a distributed  
11 control, or let's say distributed noncontrol, over the Internet  
12 and there are a number of organizations that have interest in  
13 what goes on in the Internet, and one of them is the W3C  
14 consortium, World Wide Web consortium. Another is a group of  
15 known specialists in Internet technology comprising the  
16 Internet engineering task force. And, fundamentally, they give  
17 their blessing to the standards that have been proposed in  
18 RFCs.

19 THE COURT: Okay. So they've given a blessing to a  
20 concept that is URL.

21 THE WITNESS: Well, I think it's more than a concept.  
22 It's rules about what can be and what can't be in the URL, how  
23 long URLs are, how URLs are used.

24 THE COURT: As you say, "the standards of this  
25 document prescribe the syntax and semantics for a compact

ElfWdroH

Shamos - direct

1 screen representation for a resource available called the  
2 uniform resource locator." And did that same group do  
3 something with respect to hyperlinks?

4 THE WITNESS: It's the same group that blesses the  
5 other RFCs.

6 THE COURT: Same. Okay. And so, are you saying to me  
7 that between 1999 and 2008, the group that gives its'  
8 imprimatur to these concepts did not give an imprimatur to any  
9 kind of fundamental change in URL or hyperlink or cookie, or  
10 any of those terms that we're talking about?

11 THE WITNESS: That's correct.

12 THE COURT: Okay. That cleared that up for me.

13 MR. SHATZER: Could I ask a couple of follow-ups.

14 THE COURT: It's your witness.

15 BY MR. SHATZER:

16 Q. Just to follow up on the judge's questions, most  
17 particularly Dr. Martin is relying on the use of a fragment  
18 identifier for the changes he's talking about. Were fragment  
19 identifiers a recognized part of URL strings in 1999?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Has there been any change since 1999 through 2008 to how  
22 fragment strings were used in URLs?

23 A. Well, when you say how they were used --

24 Q. Sorry. Let me withdraw that.

25 Is there any change in their functionality in the URL?

ElfWdroH

Shamos - direct

1 A. So the function of a fragment identifier is to point a  
2 browser to a particular content to display. As Dr. Martin  
3 points out in his declaration, people have figured out ways of  
4 sticking things into the fragment identifier field in a URL  
5 purely within the browser so that information can be  
6 essentially stored. It's like a storage location. You can  
7 fiddle with that fragment without causing a page reload. So  
8 there are certain efficiencies that are achieved by doing that.  
9 But the fundamental nature of what a fragment identifier is  
10 hasn't changed. A fragment identifier points to a particular  
11 part of the page that you want displayed by your browser.

12 Q. And it did that in 1999?

13 A. Yes, that was the original purpose of the fragment  
14 identifier.

15 MR. SHATZER: No further questions.

16 CROSS-EXAMINATION

17 BY MR. BUDWIN:

18 Q. Good afternoon, Dr. Shamos. My name is Josh Budwin. We  
19 haven't met before. Nice to meet you. I guess this is not the  
20 best way to do it.

21 A. Hello. How are you? I'll shake your hand later.

22 Q. You're a lawyer, is that right?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. Your license is active today?

25 A. Yes, it is.

ElfWdroH

Shamos - cross

1 Q. Would you agree with me that the automobile has existed for  
2 more than a hundred years?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. And if I were to go back to 1900 and look at the definition  
5 for an automobile, it might say something like conveyance  
6 powered by an engine with four wheels?

7 A. Hypothetically, it might.

8 Q. Same definition might apply to an automobile today?

9 A. Hypothetically, it might.

10 Q. Would you agree or disagree that the capability and use put  
11 to automobiles has materially changed in the last hundred  
12 years?

13 A. Not necessarily. I get in an automobile in one place and I  
14 drive it to another place. They may go much faster now. They  
15 may use more efficient fuels. They may be electrically  
16 powered, but it sounds to me like it's still an automobile.

17 Q. Don't you think that you just made my point for me, that  
18 the functioning capability of an automobile has changed even if  
19 the high-level, broad definition of that concept is the same,  
20 they may be more fuel efficient, they may have more power --

21 THE COURT: The function hasn't changed in my  
22 lifetime, which is 62 years. The function of the automobile  
23 has not changed. Okay? I'm prepared to make that finding.  
24 The function of an automobile has not changed.

25 MR. BUDWIN: All right.

ElfWdroH

Shamos - cross

1                   THE COURT: If you want to talk about the capability  
2 of an automobile, that may be a different question. But every  
3 time you ask function and capability, I can understand why the  
4 gentleman answers the question as he does, because the function  
5 of the automobile has not changed.

6 BY MR. BUDWIN:

7 Q. Let's move on and let's pick up exactly where the Court was  
8 asking you some questions about standard-setting activities.  
9 You have a copy of your declaration in front of you with the  
10 exhibits, correct?

11 A. I do. I have it in my binder. Is it also in the cross  
12 binder?

13 Q. Why don't you look at your binder. In particular, the  
14 Court, do you need a second to find it?

15 A. One moment. Yes, I have.

16 Q. In particular, the Court was asking you about paragraph 36.

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. The reference to URL and then there's a cite to Exhibit L.

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. Exhibit L to your declaration is request for comment,  
21 correct?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. It's request for comment 1738?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. A request for comment and standard are not the same thing,

ElfWdroH

Shamos - cross

1 you would agree with that, right?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. And do you know whether the Federal Circuit has spoken in  
4 previous cases to the applicability of not just requests for  
5 comment at the W3C but to the applicability of this specific  
6 RFC, RFC-1738, to claim construction?

7 MR. SHATZER: Objection, to the extent that this  
8 witness isn't here testifying as a lawyer.

9 THE COURT: I'm sorry. I'm two steps behind. Where  
10 are we in the cross binder?

11 MR. BUDWIN: We are looking at tab 14.

12 THE COURT: Tab 14?

13 MR. BUDWIN: Paragraph 36.

14 THE COURT: This is just his affidavit, right?

15 MR. BUDWIN: Yes, your Honor, and he's got a cite in  
16 paragraph 36 to Exhibit L. And I've asked the witness --

17 THE COURT: Are you asking him to look at Exhibit L?  
18 Where is Exhibit L?

19 MR. BUDWIN: It's going to be in the binder that has  
20 Dr. Shamos's declaration. It would be the white binder.

21 THE WITNESS: The thick white binder. Yes. And I  
22 think it's at tab L.

23 THE COURT: Thanks.

24 BY MR. BUDWIN:

25 Q. So you agree with me Exhibit L is request for comment 1738?

ElfWdroH

Shamos - cross

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. And you would agree with me that a request for comment at  
3 the W3C is different from a standard at the W3C?

4 A. It is not necessarily a standard.

5 Q. My question to you is whether you know if the Federal  
6 Circuit has case law that addresses the applicability of  
7 request for comment and, in particular, request for comment  
8 1738, to claim construction?

9 MR. SHATZER: Objection. The witness is a lawyer, but  
10 he's not here testifying as a lawyer. He's testifying as an  
11 expert. I think that's a legal question, your Honor.

12 THE COURT: The objection is overruled. I'm curious.  
13 Because one of the things I picked up on in his affidavit was  
14 this notion of standards, and, frankly, to me, little layperson  
15 that I am, if there really are standards and they haven't  
16 changed over time, I find that very salient. So if there's a  
17 way of undermining his testimony about standards, I will  
18 certainly allow Droplets to try and undermine it.

19 A. The answer is I don't know what the Federal Circuit said  
20 and I don't know the context in which they said whatever they  
21 said.

22 Q. Would you agree or disagree that the purpose of a request  
23 for comment like RFC-1738 is to collect commentary and to  
24 select language to facilitate a common understanding from a  
25 variety of competing technologies in a variety of potentially

ElfWdroH

Shamos - cross

1 competing interests? Do you agree with that?

2 A. Yes, with the objective of achieving a common acceptance of  
3 what's in the RFC so it may become standard.

4 MR. BUDWIN: Your Honor, we do have a case. I can  
5 provide the case cite and hand a copy of it up to your Honor  
6 later. It deals with this particular RFC in the context of  
7 claim construction and says it's less helpful than treatises or  
8 dictionaries. That cite is ACTV v. Disney.

9 THE COURT: Fine. Treatises and dictionary aren't  
10 your strongest evidence. They're the strongest evidence for  
11 the other side.

12 MR. BUDWIN: 346 F.3d.

13 THE COURT: If all we're talking about were treatises  
14 and dictionaries, you would have lost on this a long time ago.

15 MR. BUDWIN: 1082.

16 THE COURT: Okay.

17 BY MR. BUDWIN:

18 Q. But, at the end of the day, you would agree with me request  
19 for comment is not the same as an adopted standard?

20 A. A request for comment can become a standard. They don't  
21 all become standards.

22 Q. And I think if the request for comment that you're citing  
23 in your declaration became a standard, we could expect you to  
24 cite the standard and not the request for comment?

25 A. Not necessarily.

ElfWdroH

Shamos - cross

1 Q. Did you agree with any of Dr. Martin's testimony at all?

2 A. He spelled his name correctly.

3 Q. Beyond that --

4 A. No. He said many, main things. He testified for two  
5 hours. I'm sure he said plenty of things that were correct and  
6 that I agreed with. I just don't remember them all.

7 Q. Did you agree or do you agree that MapQuest evolved in the  
8 way that Dr. Martin described and the way that it's discussed  
9 in this Ajax book?

10 A. I agreed with that, yes.

11 Q. And do you agree that Yahoo! evolved in the way that  
12 Dr. Martin explained and showed to you and the Court?

13 A. Well, I'm not sure what your definition of evolution is,  
14 but MapQuest back then was not identical to the way MapQuest is  
15 now. So it's certainly changed.

16 Q. I moved on. I was asking about Yahoo!

17 A. Yahoo!, MapQuest, all of them, I'm not sure evolved is the  
18 right word. There are differences between MapQuest today and  
19 MapQuest in the older days, 1999 time frame.

20 Q. Did you agree or disagree with Dr. Martin's testimony about  
21 the way what we've called old Yahoo! and new Yahoo! worked?

22 A. The way --

23 THE COURT: I have to say, looking at my notes about  
24 the direct, isn't it fair to say that you agree with some of  
25 the things he said and not with other things that he said?

ElfWdroH

Shamos - cross

1                   THE WITNESS: I think that's a perfect description of  
2 it. Yes.

3                   THE COURT: We already asked him. Dr. Shamos says  
4 fragment identifier doesn't store operating state, but  
5 Dr. Martin said that it does. So?

6 BY MR. BUDWIN:

7 Q. You talked about some generic applications that you said  
8 existed prior to 1999 and were distributed applications and  
9 gave an example of a clothes picker.

10 A. No. I didn't refer to those as generic applications. I  
11 did use the word "generic" in a different context. That was a  
12 very specific application.

13 Q. You talked about a clothes picker on your direct?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. What Web site was it on?

16 A. I don't recall.

17 Q. Do you have the code for that?

18 A. I may, I may have archived it.

19 Q. Cited in your declaration, have we had a chance to review  
20 it?

21 A. No, it's not in my declaration.

22 Q. And you also referred to 1999 JavaScript as distributed  
23 applications. Do you recall that?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. Again, did you provide any of those examples in your

ElfWdroH

Shamos - cross

1 declaration?

2 A. No. Dr. Martin did. Old Yahoo! is an example of that.

3 Q. Now, you took issue with some of the descriptions in this  
4 Ajax book of the way all Web sites worked or no Web sites  
5 worked, or something of that nature, didn't you?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. Have you brought forth any contrary authoritative evidence  
8 in the form of a book, treatise, something other than your  
9 testimony, that would support that the statements in this book  
10 are incorrect?

11 A. When you say brought forth, I had no opportunity to bring  
12 forth because those declarations were filed simultaneously.

13 Q. You submitted a declaration yesterday, didn't you,  
14 Dr. Shamos?

15 A. Yes.

16 THE COURT: This is not persuasive to me. This is  
17 exactly the kind of cross-examination that makes me sick.  
18 Okay? It doesn't persuade me of anything. All right?

19 Here's what happened. You guys were told by me to  
20 have simultaneous expert declarations. Nobody responded to  
21 anything, and the only thing that got submitted yesterday was a  
22 correction, an errata. All right? So as far as I'm concerned,  
23 the defendants did exactly what I told them to do, and I'm  
24 underwhelmed by cross-examination that says, Hey, you didn't  
25 dispute this, did you. Well, that's not what I asked. I have

ElfWdroH

Shamos - cross

1 them here on the stand so that you can ask real questions,  
2 substantive questions. That's the point of this hearing, is to  
3 have you ask substantive questions so that people can  
4 supplement testimony and their testimony can be challenged. So  
5 get rid of all questions like the ones you have just asked.

6 MR. BUDWIN: Yes, your Honor.

7 Q. Dr. Shamos, would you agree or disagree that prior to the  
8 mid-2000s, the Web was stateless?

9 A. No. That's one of the statements that I definitely  
10 disagree with.

11 Q. Do you have the cross binder in front of you, Exhibit 4?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. Just take a look at that.

14 A. You mean tab four?

15 Q. Yes, please.

16 A. Yes.

17 MR. SHATZER: Do you have a reference to that? I'm  
18 without a binder.

19 MR. BUDWIN: It's going to be the Winkler blog post.

20 Q. Do you have that exhibit, Dr. Shamos?

21 A. Yes.

22 MR. SHATZER: Your Honor, we don't have that exhibit.  
23 We don't have a cross binder. I'm not sure what he's referring  
24 to.

25 THE COURT: He's referring to what says "in the

ElfWdroH

Shamos - cross

beginning." Very biblical, in the beginning, the Web was stateless, on something called Tech Block.

BY MR. BUDWIN:

Q. You would disagree with the statements that are being made in this blog post?

A. Not just disagree. I'm extremely familiar with the issue and attempts to solve the problem of statelessness, and there were effective solutions to it in 1994. So the idea that, okay, when you say in the beginning, if the beginning was the day after Tim Berners invented the World Wide Web, maybe it was stateless that next day, but it certainly wasn't stateless in 1999.

Q. Have you provided us, in your declaration, any evidence in support --

THE COURT: Like I said, I'm underwhelmed by those questions. You're not filtering correctly.

BY MR. BUDWIN:

Q. Dr. Shamos, we can all agree that URLs, hyperlinks, bookmarks, cookies, shortcuts, existed in 1999? You agree with that?

A. I don't know if we can all agree. I certainly agree.

Q. You agree?

A. Yes. I don't know what the other people think. But I think that.

Q. And to you in your testimony, those things have the same

ElfWdroH

Shamos - cross

1 meaning and the same function and capability today as they did  
2 in 1999?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. And you would disagree that the function and capability of  
5 URL, hyperlinks, bookmarks, you would disagree that those have  
6 changed between 1999 --

7 A. I agree that people have found new ways of using them. For  
8 example, the query string in a URL, query string is an  
9 arbitrary string that follows an Internet resource limited only  
10 by length and character set.

11 Q. So you --

12 A. Let me finish.

13 Q. Sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt you.

14 A. Once I can pass data from a client to a server, it is  
15 limited only by human imagination what one might do with that  
16 capability, and so certainly people are constantly dreaming up  
17 new ways to use the query string. That has not changed what a  
18 URL is or what a query string is.

19 Q. Would you agree then there are new uses or functionalities  
20 that URLs and the query string portion of URLs is being put to  
21 today than what they were being put to in 1999?

22 A. I'll certainly agree with new uses. I don't agree with  
23 functionality, and the reason for that is that the function of  
24 a URL is to pass the address of an Internet resource to a  
25 server along with certain other fields, for example, the query

ElfWdroH

Shamos - cross

1 string. That's its function. That hasn't changed.

2 Q. If we were to look at the Court's core definition of the  
3 interactive link term, there's two parts. The first part is  
4 retrieving and presenting information and the second part is  
5 restoring previous operating states.

6 A. Yes, let me get that.

7 Q. We could show it. I think it's on slide three or two.

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Now, can you, or would you, agree that URLs, bookmarks,  
10 hyperlinks, shortcuts, as they have existed since 1999, would  
11 meet the first part of this definition, the location part?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. Would you agree with me that not all links, URLs,  
14 bookmarks, hyperlinks, and shortcuts meet the second part of  
15 the definition?

16 A. I guess it depends what you mean by previous operating  
17 state. If it's simply reloading a page that was previously  
18 loaded earlier, then I think all bookmarks do that.

19 Q. How are you using the term "operating state" in this  
20 definition, Dr. Shamos?

21 A. I'm not. This is the first that you've thrown it up on the  
22 screen and asked me about it.

23 Q. What's your understanding of the term "operating state" in  
24 this definition?

25 A. Okay. So I said earlier the operating state has not been

ElfWdroH

Shamos - cross

1 subject to construction. I gave an explanation of the  
2 difference between the overarching term "state" and operating  
3 state and the difference between complete operating state and  
4 pieces of operating state. That's as far as I've gone.

5 Q. What's your understanding of the term "operating state" in  
6 this construction, if you have one? How would you define it?  
7 How would you use it as one of ordinary skill in the art?

8 A. To me, as one of ordinary skill in the art, if you say I  
9 want to capture the operating state of an application, then I  
10 understand that an application has executable code that is  
11 executed. If you interrupt the processing of an application  
12 and you want to save enough state so that you can restore the  
13 application to exactly the condition it was in at the time of  
14 interruption, then you have saved its operating state. If you  
15 save less than that, then you've saved pieces of operating  
16 state, not the entire operating state.

17 Q. And so in your understanding, operating state refers to  
18 restoring the entirety of an application state, not just some  
19 portion of it?

20 A. Well, it, I would refer to that as complete operating the  
21 state. It may not be that the complete operating state is  
22 relevant. It may not matter. For example, if the user does  
23 not rely on the totality of the functionality of the  
24 application, but only components of it, then it may be enough  
25 to capture a portion of the operating state. Here's an example

ElfWdroH

Shamos - cross

1 of that.

2 Let's suppose I bookmark a page and then later on, I select  
3 that, you know, two months later, and I select that bookmark.  
4 And let's say the Web page on the server hasn't changed in the  
5 meantime; it's exactly the same. It's brought back into my  
6 browser, so, from my point of view, I'm looking at the same  
7 page. That has restored a portion of the operating state of my  
8 browser because there's more to the state. When I left off two  
9 months earlier, I had a browsing history. I could hit the back  
10 button over and over and over again and I could get back to the  
11 previous pages.

12 When I bookmark a page, I don't save my entire browsing  
13 history. So two months from now, if I reload that page, let's  
14 say I open the browser, no browsing history, this is initial  
15 execution of the browser, I select the bookmark, the page comes  
16 up, if I hit back, it won't go anywhere. The browsing history  
17 was not saved. So is browsing history part of the operating  
18 state or not part of the operating state?

19 Q. Dr. Shamos, using your understanding of operating state,  
20 would you agree that not all links, URLs, bookmarks, and  
21 hyperlinks meet the second part of the Court's definition, that  
22 have the facility of restoring previous operating state?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. Now, in your declaration and your testimony, you talked  
25 about CDNow and the Yahoo! examples.

ElfWdroH

Shamos - cross

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. Those aren't examples of prior art that was being discussed  
3 in the prosecution history?

4 A. I don't think so.

5 Q. You didn't see any disclaimers made by the applicants about  
6 how CDNow page operates Yahoo! Web page operated?

7 A. I don't recall any such.

8 Q. Now, have you identified or are you aware of anything  
9 existing in the prior art, the patent, that you would  
10 characterize as an interactive link under the Court's core  
11 definition of that term?

12 A. I haven't looked.

13 Q. Would you characterize any part of your CDNow example or  
14 your Yahoo! example, the ones that existed prior to 1999, as  
15 meeting the Court's definition, core definition of interactive  
16 link?

17 A. Sure. Depends on what operating state means. If operating  
18 state is restoring a page that I was previously viewing, then  
19 there were plenty of interactive links that did that.

20 Q. Could be almost any Web page at the time, under that  
21 definition?

22 A. Yes. If that's operating state, then, yes.

23 Q. Now, you said you reviewed references that were discussed  
24 in the prosecution, Gish, ICE-T, LeMole?

25 A. I didn't say that. You said that. I reviewed LeMole.

ElfWdroH

Shamos - cross

1 Q. Did you review Gish and ICE-T?

2 A. No. My only knowledge of those is what I saw today.

3 Q. It's your understanding that in looking at a disclaimer, we  
4 need to look at the prior art of the applicants  
5 distinguishing --

6 MR. SHATZER: Objection to the form. Incorrect  
7 statement of the law, your Honor.

8 THE COURT: The objection to the form I'll sustain.  
9 Just ask the man a question.

10 BY MR. BUDWIN:

11 Q. You haven't reviewed Gish or ICE-T or LeMole or any of the  
12 prior art in the prosecution history in enough detail to tell  
13 us whether, in your opinion, those references have an  
14 interactive link under the Court's definition?

15 A. I wasn't asked to do that, but if this case ever moves to  
16 the invalidity phase, I suppose I will be asked to do that.

17 Q. So at this stage, you're not prepared to answer questions  
18 about those specific references?

19 A. That's right. We don't even have a construction yet of  
20 interactive link. That's what we're here today about.

21 Q. Now, you're aware, aren't you, that the patent office  
22 allowed the patent to issue over the prior art of record in  
23 part because the prior art of record didn't have interactive  
24 link?

25 THE COURT: You know --

ElfWdroH

Shamos - cross

1 A. I suppose.

2 THE COURT: Oh, never mind.

3 BY MR. BUDWIN:

4 Q. Did you think it would be helpful to answer the questions  
5 being presented today to study those references so that we  
6 could determine whether or not --

7 THE COURT: Another question that you should have  
8 pared.

9 BY MR. BUDWIN:

10 Q. Dr. Shamos, in your declaration submitted yesterday, you  
11 talked about something called session state?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. Is session state the same as or different than operating  
14 state?

15 A. I think it's different, but operating state can include  
16 session state.

17 THE COURT: Just so I know, what is session state?

18 THE WITNESS: Okay. So the whole notion of state  
19 refers to history because we use state to go back to a  
20 particular point in time. And when you go to a Web site, for  
21 example, typically you will look at the home page and you will  
22 then click on hyperlink, go to some other page, click an on  
23 another link, etc. The history of the pages that you visited  
24 is the session.

25 And in the old days, before people figured out how to

ElfWdroH

Shamos - cross

1 keep sessions within a sequence of HTTP requests and responses,  
2 when you made the second request to the Web browser, it didn't  
3 know that it was you that had made the first request. It's  
4 just responding to everybody's request, Give me this page, give  
5 me this page, give me this page. That would be useless in an  
6 online shopping environment where, for example, you're putting  
7 things in your shopping cart. If you forgot what was in your  
8 cart, you would never be able to buy anything. So a mechanism  
9 had to be found so that the Web server could recognize all of  
10 the previous interactions that you had had with it during that  
11 session. It might forget about those after a week or a month,  
12 but at least what was going on today, it ought to remember.

13 So session state doesn't directly have to do with the  
14 state of an application running on a client. It has to do with  
15 the state of interaction between the client and the server.  
16 And so that's what's normally meant by session state.

17 On the other hand, if the session is being completely  
18 mediated by the client's software, then session state and  
19 operating state are very close to one another.

20 BY MR. BUDWIN:

21 Q. Session state is a concept that's been in the art for  
22 sometime, since prior to 1999?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. Did you see any discussion in your review of the file  
25 history of the alleged disclaimers about session states?

ElfWdroH

Shamos - cross

1 A. I don't recall any.

2 Q. Now, I want to show you some of the alleged disclaimers,  
3 the same ones I was using with Dr. Martin.

4 MR. BUDWIN: Could we see slide 39.

5 Q. And have you reviewed, you've reviewed the applicant's  
6 arguments, correct?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. Do you recall the applicants in any of the arguments that  
9 they were making to the patent office in light of the prior art  
10 that was specifically of record arguing or suggesting that the  
11 prior arts -- Gish, ICE-T, LeMole -- actually had operating  
12 states? Do you remember any argument to that effect,  
13 suggestion?

14 A. No. But, it seems to me that if the applicants didn't  
15 think that the prior art references showed that, they wouldn't  
16 have needed a disclaimer, because they would have been able to  
17 distinguish their invention from those prior references.

18 Q. That's kind of the heart of my question. Isn't that the  
19 basis, would you agree that the basis on which the applicants  
20 are distinguishing the prior art of record is by the fact that  
21 the prior art of record lacks the ability to restore a prior  
22 operating state?

23 A. No.

24 Q. Let's look --

25 A. It doesn't say that.

ElfWdroH

Shamos - cross

1 Q. At slide 39. This is one of the disclaimers being pointed  
2 to about Dickman. There's a discussion here that says "URLs or  
3 other location information cannot perform the functions of  
4 interactive links as claimed." That's what the applicant's  
5 saying, right?

6 A. Yeah, I think the applicant's wrong, but the applicant said  
7 that.

8 Q. And this is what we need to look at in order to determine  
9 what the scope of the alleged disclaimer is, so the applicant  
10 is actually telling the patent office?

11 A. I understand that that's a matter of law.

12 Q. Now --

13 A. As to what we ought to be looking at to determine the scope  
14 of the disclaimer.

15 Q. You would agree with me that URLs and links have location  
16 information; that's a characteristic of all URLs and links?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. And I believe you agreed with me earlier that not all URLs,  
19 links, bookmarks, hyperlinks -- not all of them -- have  
20 operating state information, isn't that right?

21 A. Yes.

22 MR. BUDWIN: No further questions. Thank you.

23 MR. SHATZER: I have nothing further, your Honor.

24 THE COURT: I do.

25 Would you read back the last question and answer.

ElfWdroH

Shamos - cross

1 (Record read)

2 THE COURT: So?

3 THE WITNESS: I wanted to say so what when he asked me  
4 that, but I thought it would be impolite, your Honor.

5 THE COURT: Okay. I guess I'll ask him. So?

6 MR. BUDWIN: Your Honor, would you like me to go back  
7 to the podium?

8 THE COURT: No.

9 MR. BUDWIN: Your Honor, the point is when we're  
10 looking at a disclaimer, we need to look at what the applicant  
11 actually said and what the art of record actually teaches.

12 Here, the applicant is distinguishing this prior art  
13 because the applicant's saying the URLs, the links, the  
14 bookmarks, the hyperlinks, the things that are actually in  
15 these references, all they do is point to a location. That's  
16 it. They lack the facility of an interactive link, as your  
17 Honor has construed that term and as the applicants, consistent  
18 with the specification, to restore a previous operating state.  
19 That is the point.

20 The prior art is distinguished on the basis of the  
21 fact that the prior art is only talking about location. That's  
22 a characteristic of all links, all URLs, all hyperlinks. They  
23 all talk about location. But not all links, URLs, hyperlinks,  
24 bookmarks -- not all of them -- have the facility for restoring  
25 a previous operating state.

ElfWdroH

Shamos - cross

1           THE COURT: That, of course, is not what this says.

2           MR. BUDWIN: I would beg to differ, your Honor.

3           THE COURT: This doesn't say Internet shortcuts  
4 encapsulate URLs or other locator information and not all of  
5 them can perform the function of interactive links.

6           MR. BUDWIN: It says, and cannot.

7           THE COURT: No. It says and cannot. It doesn't say  
8 not all of them cannot. It certainly implies that none of them  
9 can perform the functions of Internet active links, as claimed,  
10 with which this particular witness disagrees. Now, he  
11 disagrees most vehemently and he gives me examples.

12          MR. BUDWIN: Your Honor, I would beg to differ,  
13 respectfully. They're talking about a specific reference here,  
14 the Dickman reference. There is a cite to that, and what  
15 they're saying is the Internet shortcuts encapsulate URLs or  
16 other location information. They're talking about and they're  
17 citing the specific URLs and Internet shortcuts that are being  
18 described in that specific reference, in that Dickman  
19 reference. And when we go and we look at the Dickman  
20 reference, we can confirm that those links and URLs, all they  
21 are is location information. That's it. And those specific  
22 URLs cannot perform the functions of the interactive link as  
23 claimed precisely because they lack the facility to restore the  
24 prior operating state. That is the argument that's being made,  
25 and that's the disclaimer that's being made, and the core

ElfWdroH

Shamos - cross

1 definition of this term that your Honor has already given us is  
2 sufficient to distinguish all of the prior art in the  
3 prosecution history.

4 I think the fallacy of the argument is that the  
5 applicants are not making broad, sweeping statements about all  
6 Internet shortcuts and all links and everything that existed in  
7 1999. Each disclaimer in the file history is specific to a  
8 given reference, and that's the way the disclaimer needs to be  
9 analyzed, and that's the point I'm making.

10 THE COURT: Now I understand your point.

11 By the way, thank you. You may be excused.

12 THE WITNESS: Thank you, your Honor.

13 (Witness excused)

14 MR. REICHMAN: Your Honor, as a matter of  
15 housekeeping, we have the proposed findings of fact and  
16 conclusions of law, if you'd like us to hand those up.

17 THE COURT: That would be great, and let's talk about  
18 that.

19 MR. REICHMAN: There's a hard copy and electronic.  
20 I'm not sure how your Honor would like to proceed. If you  
21 would like to hear some argument --

22 THE COURT: Yes.

23 MR. REICHMAN: -- can I impose on the Court for a  
24 short break?

25 THE COURT: Sure. I'll see you in ten minutes.

ElfWdroH

1 MR. REICHMAN: Thank you, your Honor.

2 (Recess)

3 THE COURT: It seems to me that there are two issues,  
4 apparently, although I thought there was only one. Issue No. 1  
5 is the issue that I asked you to address, which was whether I  
6 should put a limitation on the core definition of the term  
7 "interactive link" as a result of disclaimers that appear in  
8 the file wrapper relating to -- is it capabilities; is that the  
9 word that you all use -- URL, cookie, hyperlink, bookmark. And  
10 the second issue, which was introduced this morning, which was  
11 a different issue, is the one that was alluded to just before  
12 we broke, which is the disclaimers are not, in fact,  
13 disclaimers at all, they are distinctions that are being drawn,  
14 addressed entirely to specific prior art references cited by  
15 the patent examiner, and that's all that these words in the  
16 file wrapper should be considered as. And I suppose what that  
17 means is statements that were made to the patent examiner were  
18 wrong, if, for example, the statement "which have no  
19 capabilities of acting as interactive links," the last one that  
20 we were looking at, turned out to be wrong and there turns out  
21 to be prior art, maybe not prior cited but something else that  
22 was in existence in 1999 in which a URL or a bookmark was  
23 capable of being used as an interactive link, that really goes  
24 to validity, and it shouldn't be definitional. So those are  
25 two separate issues.

E1fWdroH

1           Can we talk about the definitional issue first?

2           MR. REICHMAN: Yes, your Honor. The definitional one  
3 is the second one or the first one?

4           THE COURT: The first one.

5           MR. REICHMAN: Okay. I see these questions as coming  
6 together, honestly, at some level.

7           THE COURT: All right.

8           MR. REICHMAN: As I see the first question, it's  
9 whether the limitation should be included, the negative  
10 limitation, proposed by defendants, and that question in the  
11 analytical framework that the Court provided turns on whether  
12 URLs have changed since 1999.

13           You heard the testimony today. I don't need to recast  
14 it for the Court. I think there's a difference of opinion,  
15 although it doesn't appear to be --

16           THE COURT: There's a difference of opinion.

17           MR. REICHMAN: It doesn't appear to be as deep as you  
18 might think in that I think the experts agree that it may just  
19 be semantics, terminology.

20           THE COURT: I don't think it's semantics. What I  
21 heard wasn't semantic.

22           MR. REICHMAN: And I heard some suggestion, what I  
23 heard from Dr. Shamos is that the uses of these URLs and the  
24 other technologies in the disclaimer may have changed.

25           THE COURT: No. What he said was the definition of

ElfWdroH

1 URL hasn't changed and the function of URL hasn't changed, but  
2 people have found clever new ways to employ that function over  
3 the course of the years. Indeed, I would be shocked if that  
4 were not true.

5 MR. REICHMAN: And I think that's right, your Honor.  
6 That's where I wonder whether that's just not a semantic issue,  
7 that people have found clever new ways to use them is not  
8 another way of saying that they have different capabilities  
9 today, and this is where the issues come together. If these  
10 URLs and other things had interactive links, as defined by the  
11 Court and met with in the patent, in 1999, then that's the  
12 motion for summary judgment of invalidity. That's not a claim  
13 construction issue. If that's what was going on back then,  
14 then that's a validity question.

15 The focus here today is the specific statements that  
16 were made to the patent office in connection with these four --  
17 Dickman, LeMole -- references that were made.

18 THE COURT: Right.

19 MR. REICHMAN: And I think that Dr. Shamos said it  
20 there towards the end. I wouldn't phrase it the same way, but  
21 the point, I think, is the same. He said if the art didn't  
22 have these things, you wouldn't need a disclaimer; they would  
23 just be distinguishing the art. To put it simply, that's what  
24 we're trying to say. This is not disclaimers. This is merely  
25 distinguishing the art. And I said it a different way at the

ElfWdroH

beginning, your Honor. I said you can't disclaim something that you haven't claimed in the first place. The point of a disclaimer is you say, Okay, here's what's within the patent, somebody comes along and says, No, no, look at this prior art. This prior art would be within your patent, so you carve off a piece of that limitation and say I'm going to disclaim a piece of that limitation.

According to the patentee, according to these very specific disclaimers, interactive links were not in these four prior art references. That was the point. It was never claimed in the first place, so it can't be a disclaimer, and the Federal Circuit has made that point. There are cases to that point, the proposition that a disclaimer is in the context of a statement that narrows a claim. That's what constitutes prosecution history disclaimer. There's no need for a disclaimer where the court's construction already eliminates the possibility of recapture. And I think that is what was animating the defendant's arguments and the Court's concerns in these claim constructions, the fear of recapture. You can't go disclaim something in the prior art and say you're not that and then turn around and claim that there is infringement of that same thing.

I think that there's Federal Circuit precedent, Schindler and the other cases that we cited stand for the proposition that there isn't a risk of recapture when the

ElfWdroH

1 Court's definition does the job. The definition of interactive  
2 link, if the facilities for restoring prior operating state  
3 within the Court's definition existed in the prior art the  
4 patent's invalid. Then we move on to infringement, if those  
5 facilities are not there, if all that's there is the prior art  
6 that didn't have those facilities, then there's not going to be  
7 any infringement on the infringement. It's all dealt with with  
8 bedrock principles of patent law. It's double dipping to say I  
9 understand that you distinguish the prior art by saying it  
10 didn't have the facilities for restoring previous operating  
11 state, so I'm going to put that in there, plus I'm going to  
12 also say that you're not the prior art. That's the way it was  
13 distinguished in the first place.

14 In connection with this, I think that the argument  
15 might be made, I think your Honor made it in one of the Court's  
16 ruling, saying what's the harm of it, sort of the gist. If you  
17 were disclaiming these things what's the harm.

18 THE COURT: Did I say that, what's the harm of it?

19 MR. REICHMAN: You said something along those lines;  
20 that's the way I took it. I'm probably being a little  
21 interpretive. If you're not these things, then why not just  
22 simply disclaim them. In addition to the law I just cited, I  
23 think the issue is jury confusion. This is why negative  
24 limitations are generally not favored by the Federal Circuit,  
25 and to have the jury try and figure out it's not a URL, so

ElfWdroH

which part of URLs were around in 1999, are they citing URLs from today, or are they citing URLs from 1999, the errata sheet demonstrates the opportunity for confusion, even among experts, showing the page from 2007, which really means what they wanted from 1999, because I think I'm not going out on a limb to say that we can't -- we can't as lawyers and the Court -- be pointing to evidence of how URLs operate in 2014 to invalidate this patent. That doesn't make any sense.

The whole structure of the invalidity argument has to be around prior art, not 2014 art, and to have the jury looking at it can't be a URL, which URLs can't it be, can't be a URL today, can't be a URL back in the day, and the point was it's not necessary because what's necessary for proving infringement is it's got an interactive link; that is, it has facilities for restoring a previous operating state.

You've heard testimony from Dr. Martin, and I think you can read it in the prosecution history just as well as Dr. Martin, that the applicant's point of view is that these prior references did not have interactive links, merely distinguishing those prior references, and there's no need for a disclaimer in that context.

Thank you, your Honor.

MR. SHATZER: Your Honor, we believe you were correct when you initially found these were clear disclaimers. For example, one of them is Internet shortcuts do not represent

ElfWdroH

1 interactive link. If they were just distinguishing Dickman,  
2 for example, they would have said the URL in Dickman is not  
3 what's claimed in our patent. That's what patent lawyers do  
4 all the time. These are written in the traditional language of  
5 disclaimers. They're written broadly, and maybe they're  
6 broader than they need to be, but the Federal Circuit has told  
7 us that that's Droplets's problem. If you look at USHIP  
8 Intellectual Props., LLC v. United States, 714 F.3d 1311, just  
9 from last year's Federal Circuit, the Federal Circuit said,  
10 "The fact that the applicant may have given up more than is  
11 necessary does not render the disclaimer ambiguous. The  
12 analysis focuses on what the applicant said, not whether or not  
13 the representation was necessary or persuasive."

14 In other words, they're stuck with what they said.  
15 And why is that? Because this Court and my clients and the  
16 public shouldn't have to figure out what the disclaimer means.  
17 They should be able to take it at face value. Or, to put it  
18 another way, this Court doesn't have to go through each piece  
19 of prior art they distinguished and figure out just how much  
20 disclaimer they needed to have to get around that art and limit  
21 the disclaimer to that, which is what they're suggesting is the  
22 test.

23 THE COURT: Actually, what they're suggesting is that  
24 by citing Dickman, the argument that I understand them to be  
25 making is we distinguish three pieces of prior art.

ElfWdroH

1 Distinction No. 1 was Dickman. Distinction No. 2 was, I forget  
2 the name of it, and distinction No. 3 is LeMole. And all we  
3 were doing in these three segments of our presentation to the  
4 PTO was addressing the patent that was cited in the parentheses  
5 there. We weren't making broad, sweeping statements, we were  
6 addressing that patent. And you don't have to go look at the  
7 patent to see how narrow we would have to be in order to  
8 distinguish it. All we're doing here, when we're citing  
9 Dickman and those two paragraphs, is we're distinguishing  
10 Dickman and when we're citing LeMole and these three  
11 paragraphs, we're distinguishing LeMole. That's the argument  
12 they're making today.

13 MR. SHATZER: And if you look through the rest of the  
14 prosecution history, when they wanted to say that, they said it  
15 differently. They said we don't have the XYZ in reference PDQ.  
16 They don't make broad, sweeping statements like they make here.  
17 As your Honor noted earlier, these statements are not  
18 qualified. Putting in parentheses isn't qualifying that  
19 statement. When you read these, your Honor, in your initial  
20 decision, you viewed them as clear disclaimers. That's how we  
21 read them. That's what the Federal Circuit says you ought to  
22 do. I think their point is we didn't need to disclaim that  
23 much, and what the Federal Circuit said is so what, you did.

24 THE COURT: I understand that. I know that rule. So  
25 the issue is do I continue, in light of the arguments that are

ElfWdroH

1 now being made, the testimony I heard, whatever, to read them  
2 as disclaimers or do I change my mind, and say they're trying  
3 to distinguish these three patents here and anyway the whole  
4 issue will come up on the inevitable summary judgment motion to  
5 invalidate the patent on the ground that you could restore  
6 prior operating states in 1999 through the use of interactive  
7 links. That's what bookmarks did. I assume you're making that  
8 motion.

9 MR. SHATZER: Depending on what your Honor rules, we  
10 may very well. Depending on the definition of interactive  
11 link, yes, we may very well.

12 THE COURT: I don't think that my interpretation of  
13 interactive link probably has much of anything to do with  
14 whether you have made that motion or not. At least it wouldn't  
15 if I were litigating, but I'm not the litigator.

16 MR. SHATZER: In fact, your Honor, I think our motion  
17 at this point would be for noninfringement.

18 Your Honor, just to summarize, you have to take these  
19 at face value. It doesn't matter what the art said. They are  
20 clear disclaimers. The Federal Circuit's told us that you're  
21 stuck with what you said, even if you said too much.

22 Another important case, your Honor, is the Biogen  
23 case. The Biogen case actually has some facts very similar to  
24 ours. It's a biotechnology case, but situation was this.  
25 Somebody was prosecuting a patent for an antibody and they

ElfWdroH

1 limited their claim by saying that the antibody only attached  
2 to the large loop of the antigen protein chain, and then, lo  
3 and behold, somebody, Smith-Kline, made an antibody that  
4 attached to the small loop and Biogen sued them, and  
5 Smith-Kline said you limited your claim to the large loop.  
6 Biogen's response was we didn't know about the small loop,  
7 nobody knew that at the time. The court said it doesn't  
8 matter. If you disclaimed, you disclaimed. Same facts here.  
9 Something happened later, if your disclaimer is broad enough to  
10 cover what happened later, that's your problem. That's the  
11 facts of Biogen, very close to our facts, your Honor.

12 Just to summarize the testimony, and I don't think I  
13 need to say too much because I think Dr. Shamos was very clear,  
14 but the point is that the meaning and material capabilities of  
15 URLs, bookmarks, hyperlinks, cookies, shortcuts hasn't changed.  
16 The uses have changed, but they could have been put to those  
17 uses earlier based on how they function. It was just a  
18 question of whether there was a need for it or somebody thought  
19 of it or somebody decided to do that. That's different.  
20 That's true with everything, frankly.

21 THE COURT: I understand, it's true with everything.  
22 It's certainly true with automobiles. But that's why I'm  
23 wondering why your focus isn't on invalidity, but okay. That's  
24 why I'm not a patent lawyer. I'm just a judge.

25 MR. SHATZER: To be specific, the one example that

ElfWdroH

1 they focus on is this use of fragment identifiers, and those  
2 fragment identifiers were available before 1999 and they didn't  
3 do anything different in the example they used in 2005 than  
4 they did in 1999. Nobody used them in that particular way, but  
5 the way they worked was the same exact way and they were part  
6 of that standard. Somebody had to go in and say we want to  
7 have something called a fragment identifier. You identify with  
8 a panel. Afterwards you have to put certain information in  
9 there, and that was pre-1999, and people had used them for all  
10 sorts of different things. All they've done is picked one  
11 later on and said it's a big change because it works better,  
12 but that has nothing to do with what a URL is. Has nothing to  
13 do with what it means or its capabilities. It was capable of  
14 doing that in 2000, 1999.

15 THE COURT: To help me clarify, let's say I agree with  
16 you. Let's say I think that this argument that there's been  
17 some change in the meaning or the capability as opposed to the  
18 use to which URLs, fragment identifiers, bookmarks, what have  
19 you, have been put over the course of time, is that ultimately  
20 a definitional issue, or is that a validity issue?

21 MR. SHATZER: I think, because we have a disclaimer  
22 here, it's a definitional issue.

23 THE COURT: And what if I decide that it's not, that  
24 there's no disclaimer, that this is simply distinguishing? If  
25 I were to decide that, does the issue drop out of the case, or

ElfWdroH

1 does it then become a validity issue?

2 MR. SHATZER: I think with respect to this particular  
3 term, even if it drops out, it remains both a noninfringement  
4 and a validity issue.

5 THE COURT: How your stuff works as opposed to how  
6 their stuff works, I haven't thought about. It's easier for me  
7 to think about invalidity than it is to think about  
8 infringement because I don't know how your product works except  
9 that the screen shows me the picture, I press the hyperlink,  
10 the screen shows me a different picture.

11 MR. SHATZER: Understood. But, your Honor, if you're  
12 rethinking whether there was a disclaimer, I would urge you to  
13 look through the rest of the document.

14 THE COURT: I am rethinking it.

15 MR. SHATZER: And look how they distinguish as opposed  
16 to how they disclaim, because they do it very differently.

17 THE COURT: And that would be a useful thing to have  
18 pointed out to me.

19 MR. SHATZER: And the other thing, I think, that would  
20 be helpful, and the reason we think this disclaimer is  
21 important is because the reason they're fighting against it is  
22 we believe that they want to accuse of infringement saying that  
23 we're in the prior art, and we want that to not happen because  
24 it shouldn't because they disclaim that, and that's why they're  
25 fighting so hard for this, your Honor.

ElfWdroH

1                   THE COURT: Everybody's fighting hard for it because  
2 you want to win the case at the definitional stage. I wasn't  
3 kidding when I said that. I've been around this track before.  
4 This is not the first time I've had people come in here  
5 slugging at the definitional stage to try to deliver the  
6 knockout blow to end the case one way or the other.

7                   MR. SHATZER: One reason we're struggling here,  
8 frankly, we don't know what they claim to be the interactive  
9 link in our client's product. They point to a bookmark, but we  
10 don't know what the URL is in that bookmark. We don't know how  
11 it works. We don't know what they're accusing. We want this  
12 claim term to be as clear as possible, based on their own  
13 statements, so that we can understand what we're being accused  
14 of and what this claim does and doesn't cover. This  
15 interpretation is real important to both infringement and  
16 validity.

17                  THE COURT: Yes?

18                  MR. REICHMAN: Very briefly, I think the framing of  
19 the issue as between validity infringement versus definitional,  
20 I think, is the point that we're trying to make, so I won't  
21 belabor it. That is the point. These are validity and  
22 infringement arguments. Droplets is not trying to hit a  
23 knockout blow and trying to avoid having the definitions  
24 preempt the entire infringement and validity analysis.

25                  The only thing I'd point the Court to, for the sake of

ElfWdroH

brevity at the end of the day, is that these disclaimers we're looking at, for example, if you look in the prosecution history, the one we were looking at on the board, page 39 of the slides, where we had Dickman in parentheses, that debate, the title of that section was No. 1, what we were looking at, but the title of the section issue B, rejection of claims thus and so as being unpatentable over Gish in view of ICE-T.

THE COURT: That's not on this screen, you see. What you're reading is not on the screen. You're the one that came up with the screen shot, and that's not what it says. You have "Internet shortcuts do not represent an interactive link." That title is very broad and very general and suggests that you are disclaiming, that's certainly how I read it originally, that you are disclaiming the notion that Internet shortcuts, like bookmarks, are the interactive link that is referenced in your patent.

MR. REICHMAN: You're right.

THE COURT: And bookmark is an interactive shortcut. That is an Internet shortcut. That's what it is. And I have to tell you, if I had to rule this second, the definition of bookmark has not changed.

MR. REICHMAN: And, your Honor, because that is what the slide says is why I wanted to make this one more point at the end of a long day, it's in the record, it's in Exhibit KK of the plaintiff's submission, I've put it up on the Elmo, the

ElfWdroH

1 section, and this is similar, the same as dealt with in the  
2 other section, four different sections that are cited, it's  
3 clear from the context, and that's what the Federal Circuit  
4 says you have to look at, that what is being distinguished,  
5 what is being discussed are these prior art references. Nobody  
6 mischaracterizes the teaching of Dickman in support of the  
7 assertions, and it goes on to explain why Dickman is  
8 distinguished from the patent claims.

9           Dickman did not have an interactive link. That's the  
10 point. Gish did not have interactive link. ICE-T did not have  
11 an interactive link. It's distinguishing the prior art. So if  
12 the prior art did have those things and the patentee was wrong,  
13 that's a motion for summary judgment of invalidity, and if the  
14 accused products, at the end of the day, don't have anything  
15 more than these unadorned prior art concepts -- that is, no  
16 interactive link -- then it's a motion for noninfringement.  
17 This is not to be dealt with defitionally without the fullness  
18 of seeing what's actually at issue.

19           Thank you, your Honor.

20           MR. SHATZER: I don't have anything else, your Honor.

21           THE COURT: Okay. This was fun. It was, actually.  
22 You have no idea how we spent the rest of the week. Thank you  
23 very much. I'll try to get something out in the next ten days.

24           MR. REICHMAN: Thank you, your Honor.

25                         oo

E1fWdroH

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1 INDEX OF EXAMINATION  
2

3 Examination of:	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25		
DAVID W. MARTIN																								
Direct By Mr. Budwin . . . . .	12																							
Cross By Mr. Shatzer . . . . .	56																							
Redirect By Mr. Budwin . . . . .	72																							
MICHAEL IAN SHAMOS																								
Direct By Mr. Shatzer . . . . .	77																							
Cross By Mr. Budwin . . . . .	93																							